


Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BR162 .K46

Kidd, B. J. (Beresford James), 18MAIN
A history of the church to A.D. 461 / by



3 9967 00092 9187

ACCESSION NUMBER

51554

SHELF NUMBER

BR 162 K 46

The Virginia Library

McCormick

Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago

826 Belden Avenue

From

Received

March 1923

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen

New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town

Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai

HUMPHREY MILFORD

Publisher to the University

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

TO A.D. 461

BY

Brustein
B. J. KIDD, D.D.

WARDEN OF KEBLE COLLEGE; HONORARY CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH
AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

VOLUME III

A.D. 408-461

UNIVERSITY OF CHURCH

OF OXFORD

PRINTED BY THE CLARENDON PRESS

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1922

YARSEL ARIOREY

XORROOON

YARROOON JARROOON

DA
162
K46

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE FIRST DECADE (i): INNOCENT I; DONATISM	3
II.	THE FIRST DECADE (ii): AUGUSTINE, JEROME, ALARIC	29
III.	THE EAST, c. 410	49
IV.	PELAGIANISM (i): IN ROME, 400-10	54
V.	PELAGIANISM (ii): IN AFRICA, 410-15	65
VI.	PELAGIANISM (iii): 415-18, IN PALESTINE, AFRICA, ROME	87
VII.	THE OVERTHROW OF PELAGIANISM, 418- 31	115
VIII.	AUGUSTINIANISM, SEMI-PELAGIANISM, AND THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF GRACE, 429-529	134
IX.	THE CASE OF APIARIUS	162
X.	THE EAST UNDER THEODOSIUS II, 408-†50. I. THE GREAT SEES. II. MONASTICISM	172
XI.	NESTORIUS AND CYRIL, 428-31	192
XII.	THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, 431	218
XIII.	REUNION: AND THE END OF NESTORIAN- ISM WITHIN THE EMPIRE, 432-5	254
XIV.	EUTYCHIANISM, 435-48	277
XV.	THE LATROCINIUM, 449	301

16.2.483

CHAP.	PAGE
XVI. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, 451 . . .	311
XVII. THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALEN- TINIAN III, 425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA, 425-†50 : (i) THE BAR- BARIAN INVASIONS ; (ii) IRELAND . . .	340
XVIII. THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALEN- TINIAN III, 425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA, 425-†50 : (iii) GAUL ; (iv) SPAIN ; (v) AFRICA	353
XIX. THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALEN- TINIAN III, 425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA, 425-†50 : (vi) ITALY, AND ST. LEO THE GREAT, 440-†61	380
XX. THE EAST AFTER CHALCEDON, 451-82 . . .	395
XXI. THE CHURCHES BEYOND THE EMPIRE . . .	414
INDEX	430

ERRATA

- p. 214, note 3, *for atatement read statement.*
- p. 349, line 14, *for Politus read Potitus.*
- p. 371, lines 16, 17, *for Theodore read Theodoric.*
- p. 389, last line but two, *for Galasius read Gelasius.*
- p. 414, last line but one, *for 519-†27 read 491-†518.*
- p. 424, last line, *for 515 read 519.*

PART III
THE FIFTH CENTURY, TO A.D. 461

NOTE.—The Documents, to which reference is made in this volume, are those of *Documents illustrative of the History of the Church*, vol. ii, A. D. 313-461 (S.P.C.K.)

CHAPTER I

THE FIRST DÉCADE (i): INNOCENT I; DONATISM

IN the West, during the first decade of the fifth century, interest centres (i) at Rome, where the pontificate of Innocent I, 402–†17, coincides with the decline of Milan consequent upon the withdrawal of the Court to Ravenna, 402, and so marks a stage of importance in the growth of the authority of his See; (ii) in Africa, where the episcopate, led by Aurelius and Augustine and supported from Rome and Ravenna, was engaged in giving the *coup de grâce* to Donatism, 411; (iii) round the great names of Augustine and Jerome who were occupied in controversy: Augustine, 404, with Felix the Manichæan; Jerome and Augustine, to 405, with each other; and Jerome, 404–6, with Vigilantius; (iv) finally, in Italy, where the death of Stilicho, 23 August 408, was speedily avenged by the invasion of Alaric and the capture of Rome, 24 August 410. Innocent and Donatism will occupy us in this chapter; Jerome, Augustine, and Alaric in the next.

I

Innocent I¹ was bishop of Rome from 402–†17. The feebleness of all other authority in the West combined with his own character² and talents³ to make of his pontificate an epoch in the development of the powers of the Roman see. He was frequently consulted, and made good use of decretals in reply. Like other popes he knew also how to make respectful language a basis for the exercise or the acquisition of an authority never acknowledged by the applicant, and to turn every occasion to similar advantage.

§ 1. Thus one of his first acts was directed to Illyria: whither he dispatched *Cum Deus noster*⁴ of 402. In this letter he an-

¹ For the letters of Innocent I, see *P. L.* xx. 457–638; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 44–9; cf. Tillemont, *Mém.* xi. 627–66; Milman, *Latin Chr.*⁹ i. 104–40.

² *Aug. Ep.* cli, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 518 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 646).

³ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxiii, § 12.

⁴ *Ep.* i (*P. L.* xx. 465); Jaffé, No. 285.

nounces his accèssion to Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica 383-†410, and renews to him the office of Papal Vicar in Eastern Illyricum, which Damasus had first bestowed on Ascholius,¹ and Anysius himself had received first from Siricius² and then from Anastasius.³ Western Illyricum consisted at this time of seven 'provinces' in the 'diocese' of Italy, six⁴ of which lay on the upper waters of the Danube, the Drave and the Save, and were in the hands of the barbarians, Alaric having his seat of authority there at Aemona,⁵ now Laibach; and the seventh, Dalmatia, with its capital Salona, being situate on the Adriatic. Ecclesiastically, the six gravitated towards Aquileia: while Dalmatia, under its metropolitan, the bishop of Salona, gravitated towards Rome. Civilly, Western Illyricum was part of the Western Empire. So also had Eastern Illyricum once been, till 379. It consisted of the two 'dioceses' of Dacia and Macedonia,⁶ which together made up the Praefecture of Illyricum, and extended from Belgrade and Sofia to Cape Matapan and Crete. In that year Gratian handed it over to Theodosius I, and part of the Eastern Empire it remained: though Stilicho bent all his efforts to recover it for the realm of Honorius.⁷ But the popes had never allowed it to leave their orbit; and this was the purport of the renewal of the Vicariate⁸ by Innocent I to Anysius, and afterwards to his successor, Rufus,⁹ 410-†31. The bishop of Thessalonica exercised the papal authority there; and Eastern Illyricum was thus taught still to look, in things ecclesiastical, towards Rome, though in things temporal it had become attached to Constantinople. Nor did the Pope deal with the affairs of Illyria, only through his Vicar: he dealt with them direct. Letters of his to the bishops of Macedonia are extant, regulating the affair of Bonosus and clergy ordained by him¹⁰;

¹ F. W. Puller, *Prim. Saints* ³, 156, n. 1.

² *Ep.* iv (*P. L.* xiii. 1148 sq.); Jaffé, Nos. 257, 259; and Leo, *Ep.* vi, § 2 (*Op.* i. 620; *P. L.* liv. 617 c), Jaffé, No. 404.

³ Innocent, *Ep.* i (*P. L.* xx. 465 A).

⁴ W. to E. they were: Noricum Ripense and N. Mediterraneum, Pannonia I and II, Valeria Ripensis, Savia.

⁵ In Noricum Med., Hodgkin, i. ii. 661, n. 1, 766.

⁶ Latin was the language of Dacia and Greek of Macedonia, Soz. vii. iv, § 1. On Illyricum, and the modern countries it covered, see Hodgkin, i. ii. 677 sqq., n. H.

⁷ Hodgkin, i. ii. 746.

⁸ On this Vicariate, see L. Duchesne, *The Churches separated from Rome*, c. vi.

⁹ On 17 June 412, *Ep.* xiii (*P. L.* xiii. 515-17); Jaffé, No. 300.

¹⁰ *Ep.* xvi (*P. L.* xx. 519-21); Jaffé, No. 299. Bonosus was not bishop of

re-establishing Photinus, a bishop deposed under misapprehension by Anastasius¹; declining to condemn a deacon, Eustathius²; and condemning two Cretans whose case had been referred to him.³ It was thus a wide authority that Innocent I wielded in Illyria.

§ 2. Nor was his authority less in Spain and Gaul, as is evident from a series of documents dating from the first years of his pontificate and addressed to the episcopate, or to individual bishops, of those countries.

(1) Thus, 402, in answer to congratulations on his accession, accompanied by a series of questions, from certain Gallic bishops, Innocent held a Synod at Rome, and replied in its sixteen canons.⁴ Clerks [c. 3] in Holy Orders must remain unmarried, because of their constant attendance upon Baptism and the Eucharist. Bishops [c. 6] ought to be thoroughly at one in the faith. At Eastertide [c. 7] the presbyter and the deacon may baptize, even in the bishop's presence; but, at other times, the presbyter only in case of necessity, and the deacon not at all. No Christian may marry [c. 9] his deceased wife's sister, or [c. 11] his uncle's wife or child. No one [c. 12] is to be consecrated bishop unless he be first a cleric. Excommunications [cc. 14, 16] in one diocese are to be respected elsewhere. And [c. 15] no bishop may interfere in the diocese of another. 'If these rules be but observed,' the Synod concludes, 'there will be no schisms nor heresies, and the Gentiles will say that God is in us of a truth.'⁵

(2) Shortly afterwards Innocent sent *Etsi tibi, frater*,⁶ of 15 February 404, to Victricius, bishop of Rouen 395-†415. Victricius was a man of apostolic poverty⁷; and, as bishop, had carried the Gospel to the barbarians of what is now Flanders and Hainault.⁸ He was a correspondent of Paulinus, bishop of Nola

Sardica (as Marius Mercator, *Dissertatio*, § 15 [P. L. xlviii. 928 B]) but of Nish (P. L. xx. 519 A). His heresy [(1) that Mary had other sons, and (2) adoptionism] and his schism raised the question of the validity of his ordinations; whence the interest of the decisions taken by Siricius, *Ep.* ix [A. D. 392] (P. L. xiii. 1176-8; Jaffé, No. 261), and of Innocent I in *Ep.* xvi [A. D. 409], and xvii [A. D. 414], § 8 (P. L. xx. 531 A). See Jaffé, No. 303.

¹ *Ep.* xvii, § 14 (P. L. xx. 535 sq.).

² *Ibid.*, § 15 (P. L. xx. 536 sq.).

³ *Ep.* xviii [A. D. 414] (P. L. xx. 537-9).

⁴ Mansi, iii. 1133-40; Hefele, ii. 428-30.

⁵ Mansi, iii. 1139 c.

⁶ *Ep.* ii (P. L. xx. 468-81); Jaffé, No. 286; Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 667-74; Fleury, xxi, c. li.

⁷ Paulinus, *Ep.* xxxvii, § 3 (*Op.* 224; P. L. lxi. 534).

⁸ *Ep.* xviii, § 4 (*Op.* 99; P. L. lxi. 239).

409-†31, who had seen him with St. Martin at Vienna,¹ and also knew much of him through Paschasius, a deacon of Rouen, whom he met in Rome.² Victricius also had visited Rome,³ and was personally known to Pope Innocent: whence, perhaps, his request for information, § 1, about the rules observed by the Roman church in various points of discipline. Innocent replies, § 2, that 'with the help of the holy apostle Peter, through whom both apostolate and episcopate in Christ took their beginning', he is anxious that the Church should be presented to God 'without spot or wrinkle'. Victricius has done well in looking for a model to the Roman church, not that the rules he now sends contain anything new: they are simply derived from the tradition of the Apostles and the Fathers, though too generally unknown or disregarded. Then follow, §§ 3-16, fourteen rules, not unlike those of the decretal of Siricius to Himerius of Tarragona, and dealing, in the main, with ordinations and the continence of the clergy. No. 1 forbids clandestine consecrations by a single bishop or without the consent of the metropolitan. No. 3 refers ordinary causes to the com-provincials but 'without prejudice to the Roman church which, in all causes, is to have her customary reverence'; while the greater causes, after the judgement of the local episcopate, are to be 'referred to the Apostolic See, as the Synod has decreed'. The context would suggest that Innocent held it to have been the Nicene Synod which gave him this jurisdiction; but it was actually the Synod of Sardica. In No. 12 he insists on the undesirableness of ordaining a person liable to municipal office. He would find himself deceived if he thought this was a way out of its burdens: for Theodosius had ordered, 17 June 390, that no born *curialis* ordained since 388 should be freed from his obligations except on condition of renouncing his patrimony⁴; and he would have 'to preside, or at least be present, at the heathen shows and games'.

(3) Next year Innocent was consulted again from Gaul, and dispatched *Consulenti tibi*,⁵ of 20 February 405, to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse⁶ 405-†15. He was one of the most illustrious bishops of Gaul. Jerome extols his charity. 'No man,' says he, 'is richer than he who carries the Body of the Lord in a wicker

¹ Paulinus, *Ep.* xviii, § 9 (*Op.* 102; *P. L.* lxi. 242 B).

² *Ibid.*, § 1 (*Op.* 97; *P. L.* lxi. 237 B).

³ Innocent, *Ep.* ii, § 14 (*P. L.* xx. 478 A).

⁴ *Cod. Theod.* xii. i. 121.

⁵ *Ep.* vi (*P. L.* xx. 495-502); Mansi, iii. 1038-41; Jaffé, No. 293.

⁶ Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 617-20; Fleury, xxii. iv.

basket, and his Blood in a glass.'¹ It would seem that Exuperius, like Cyril of Jerusalem,² Ambrose,³ Augustine,⁴ Chrysostom (if we may make the natural inference from some of the charges of the Synod of the Oak), and Deogratias, archbishop of Carthage had sold the sacred vessels for the relief of the needy; and Jerome⁵ also ascribes to his merits the preservation of Toulouse, up to 409, the date of his writing, "from the Vandals and other barbarians who crossed the Rhine, 31 December 406, and overran Gaul."⁶ Mayence was taken, and thousands were massacred in church. Worms fell after a long siege. Rheims, Amiens, Arras, Terouanne, Tournay, Spire, Strasburg became German towns. Aquitaine, Gascony, the provinces of Lyons and Narbonne were all laid waste. Spain was on the point of succumbing⁷; for Vandals, Alans, and Sueves swarmed over the Pyrenees on Michaelmas Eve, 409.⁸ Only Toulouse held out: by the aid, it was believed, of Exuperius. Such was his reputation. He now asked the advice of Pope Innocent, on several points of discipline; and received, in reply, a decretal of unusual interest. The Pope begins, of course, § 1, by commending Exuperius for 'following the habit of the wise and referring doubtful questions to the Apostolic See'. These were seven in all. No. I (§§ 2-4) concerns the continence of the clergy; and Innocent refers him to the rule laid down by Siricius, in the decretal to Himerius,⁹ to the effect that married men, after ordination, are not to cohabit with their wives. No. II (§§ 5, 6) deals with those who, after baptism, lived a profligate life, and then asked for Communion at their death. The Pope replies that, in old days, penance only would have been granted to them, not Communion; for, when persecutions were frequent, the Church was afraid that, if restoration to Communion were easy, lapses would be common. So her rule was strict.¹⁰ But now she can afford to be merciful. Let them

¹ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxv, § 20 (*Op.* i. 947; *P. L.* xxii. 1085).

² Soz. *H. E.* iv. xxv.

³ *De officiis*, ii, § 138 (*Op.* ii. i. 103; *P. L.* xvi. 140).

⁴ Possidius, *Vita*, § 24 (*Op.* x, app. 274 E; *P. L.* xxxii. 54).

⁵ Victor Vitensis, *De pers. Vand.* i, § 8 (*Op.* 7; *P. L.* lviii. 191 B).

⁶ Fleury, xxii, c. xvi; Gibbon, c. xxx (iii. 267 sqq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 739.

⁷ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxiii, § 16 (*Op.* i. 913 sq.; *P. L.* xxii. 1057 sq.), and Document No. 148. The picture is filled out by Zosimus, *Hist.* vi, § 3, and Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 40 (*Op.* 576; *P. L.* xxxi. 1165 sq.).

⁸ Hodgkin, i. ii. 824.

⁹ Siricius, *Ep.* i, §§ 8-11 (*P. L.* xiii. 1138-41).

¹⁰ Thus penance was allowed but once (Bingham, *Ant.* xviii. iv, § 1), and sometimes refused absolutely, to criminals, e. g. Cyprian, *Ep.* lv, § 21 (*C. S. E. L.* iii. ii. 638 sq.).

therefore—as a protest against the hard-heartedness of Novatianism—have Communion as a *Viaticum*, for this is now the custom of the Church.¹ In Nos. III and V (§§ 7, 8, 11) the response to a question whether a Christian may, as a magistrate, inflict, or as a petitioner invoke, the punishment of death, is in the affirmative; for the State is a Divine Institution. St. Ambrose, when consulted upon this head, had returned the same answer.² No. IV (§ 10) declares that the guilt of adultery is no greater in a woman than in a man, but only more patent, as it was in the case of Jerome's friend Fabiola. She had married a second husband, after divorcing her first for his vices; and she had to do penance one Easter Even at St. John Lateran.³ No. VI (§ 12) requires that divorce followed by remarriage is to be treated as adultery.⁴ In No. VII (§ 13) Innocent sets down a list of 'Canonical Books'. It agrees with the list of the Council of Carthage, 397, admitting Tobit, Judith, and 1 and 2 Maccabees; and, in the New Testament, 'not only rejects but condemns all such as have appeared' (in addition to our New Testament) 'under the names of Matthew, James the Less, Peter, John, Andrew, Leucius' or 'of Nexocharis and Leonidas, philosophers'.

§ 3. No less important—specially in the liturgical field—is a letter to one of his suffragans who owed him allegiance as metropolitan of Rome, viz. *Si instituta*⁵ of 19 March 416. It was sent to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium; now Gubbio, in Umbria, some 24 miles NNE. of Perugia. Innocent begins, § 1, by requiring uniformity, in rites and ceremonies, so that the faithful be not scandalized. The Roman customs, § 2, 'handed down to the Roman church by the Prince of the Apostles, Peter', are to be kept everywhere: the more so as 'throughout Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the neighbouring islands, no churches were founded save those for which the venerable Apostle Peter, or his successors, provided bishops'. The assertion is a bold one. It ignores the work of St. Paul in the West, and makes large assumptions about the origins of the churches of Lyons and the neighbourhood. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that Innocent claims an authority for the Roman customs only in lands which,

¹ Document, No. 124.

² Ambrose, *Ep.* xxv, §§ 2, 9 (*Op.* II. i. 892 sq.; *P. L.* xvi. 1040-2).

³ Jerome, *Ep.* lxxvii, § 4 (*Op.* i. 459 sq.; *P. L.* xxii. 692).

⁴ Document No. 124, §§ 10, 12.

⁵ *Ep.* xxv (*P. L.* xx. 551-61); Jaffé, No. 311; Fleury, xxiii. xxxii.

with Illyricum, make up the legitimate sphere of the Roman, or Western, patriarchate. He next observes, § 3, that Decentius had often assisted him in church at Rome, and would know how things were done there; and he then goes on to give directions in view of the liturgical and disciplinary peculiarities of Eugubium. They are all characteristic of the use which is conventionally called the 'Gallican' or, by others, the 'non-Roman', rite of the West; for it was found in North Italy, Gaul, Spain, Britain, and Ireland; and intrusively, as appears from this important letter, at Eugubium. No wonder Innocent was taken aback by foreign, or 'non-Roman', customs so firmly rooted in a church of his metropolitanate. Thus, § 4, the Kiss of Peace is not to be given before the Consecration, but after it: i.e. the place, which it occupied in the 'non-Roman' rites of Milan¹ and of the countries beyond the Alps,² is to be given up in favour of the place, just before Communion, now assigned to it in the Roman liturgy³ and the Romanized rites of Milan.⁴ Similarly, § 5, as to 'the recitation of the names'⁵ of those who make offerings at the Mass. 'What had been done at Gubbio was to read out the names of the offerers at a point in the service corresponding to that at which the recital of names of offerers and of the dead is indicated in the Gallican books, i.e. just before the Gallican *post nomina* prayer.'⁶ This prayer belongs to the Offertory, and corresponds to the *super oblata* or 'secret' of the Roman Mass. 'The oblations, therefore, are to be commended first,' says Innocent, 'and (only) then are the names of those whose they are to be proclaimed: so that they may be named in the course of the sacred mysteries [*sc.* the Canon]—not in the course of those other things [*sc.* the Offertory] which we place before, in order to open the way by (our) prayers for the mysteries themselves that are to follow.'⁷ 'The place in the Canon at which the names were recited in Rome may be assumed to have been in the neighbourhood of the *Memento vivorum*.'⁸ Innocent then continues, § 6,

¹ In Milan it occurred immediately after 'the Offertory' and just before the *Oratio super sindonem*, or 'Prayers of the Faithful', Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*⁵, 207, n. 1, 213.

² In Gaul and Spain it followed the Diptychs or 'Great Intercession', and immediately preceded the *Sursum corda*, *ibid.* 211.

³ *Ibid.* 184.

⁴ *Ibid.* 212.

⁵ Document No. 128. On the interpretation here adopted, see R. H. Connolly in *J. T. S.* xx. 215–26 (April 1919).

⁶ *Ibid.* 221 sq.

⁷ *Tr.* from *J. T. S.* xx. 221.

⁸ *Ibid.* 223.

that the custom once common in North Italy,¹ Gaul,² Spain,³ and Sardinia⁴ of allowing presbyters to confirm with oil blessed by the bishop is to be given up : an interesting decision, for it shows that the difference between East and West to-day as to the minister of Confirmation is simply one of discipline, the doctrine behind it being common to both. This doctrine is that the bishop alone is the minister, or *sacerdos*, of his church⁵ ; the question being how much of his spiritual duties he shall delegate to his assistant-presbyters : baptism, penance, and the eucharist only ? or confirmation, as the completion of baptism, as well ? Innocent now resumed for the episcopate a rite with the ministration of which, as to this day in the East, so formerly in large areas of the West, the bishop had parted. Next follows an interesting direction, § 7, to keep Saturday as a fast-day, just as men keep Friday and the Lord's Day, every week. If the annual commemoration of the Lord's death and Resurrection covers three days, so should the weekly ; it is absurd to keep Friday and Sunday, but not Saturday. Innocent thus treats Saturday as a fast-day and a non-liturgical day⁶ ; and is here of opinion that Mass ought not to be said either on Friday or Saturday, any more than on Good Friday and Easter Even. The fifth direction, § 8, concerns the *fermentum*⁷ : a portion of a Host consecrated at a previous Eucharist, which the Pope sent round every Lord's Day to his presbyters in order to make their next celebration of it visibly one with his own, and so to affirm the unity of the church under its bishop. He confines the sending of it to the churches of Rome within the city. Then others deal with the restoration, § 9, of *energumens* ; the reconciliation, § 10, of penitents⁸ on Maundy Thursday ; and, § 11, the anointing of the

¹ Innocent, *Ep.* xxv, § 6 (*P. L.* xx. 554 sq.).

² See Co. of Orange [A. D. 441], cc. 1, 2 (Mansi, vi. 435 sq.), and of Epaone [A. D. 517], c. 16 (Mansi, viii. 561).

³ See Co. of Toledo I [A. D. 400], c. 20 (Mansi, iii. 1002).

⁴ Greg. *Epp.* lib. iv, Nos. 9 and 26 (*Op.* iii. 689 A, 705 ; *P. L.* lxxvii. 677, 696), and for this evidence, see Duchesne, *Chr. W.*⁵ 338, n. 2 ; J. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*², 82, n. 31.

⁵ The principle runs back to Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrnaeos*, viii, § 2 ; for its exposition, see Wordsworth, *M. G.*² 156 sq.

⁶ The rule, at Milan as in the East, was to keep Saturday as a feast-day and a liturgical day. Augustine refers to these differences of custom, *Ep.* liv, §§ 2, 3 (*ut sup.*), and *Ep.* lxxxii, § 14 (*Op.* ii. 194 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 281). He was for treating them as indifferent ; Innocent for uniformity, in all churches supposed to have sprung from the Roman.

⁷ Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*⁵, 163, 185 ; Wordsworth, *M. G.*² 160, 185, 381.

⁸ Duchesne, *Chr. W.*² 439 sqq. ; Wordsworth, *M. G.*² 374.

sick.¹ The oil is to be consecrated only by the bishop (in the East, to-day, its consecration is further reserved, to patriarchs only); but it may be administered by priests, or by the faithful, to themselves or to one another. Decentius is then finally reminded, § 12, that his church should in all things observe the customs of the church of Rome, to which it owes its origin: 'any further details you may ask me, and I shall be able to tell you, when we meet.'

So ends not the least interesting, or important, of Innocent's decretals now under review. There were others to Africa; but they are best dealt with later on, in their connexion with the Pelagian controversy.

II

We have now to trace the decline of Donatism in that country, 401-11.

§ 4. In 401 the African episcopate, as we have seen, had taken its own course in dealing with Donatism. At the fifth African Council,² of 16 June, Aurelius and his colleagues, in view of the scarcity of clergy which he deplores,³ ruled, by the first of nine canons,⁴ that Donatists, baptized in infancy, should be treated, on rallying to the Church, as capable of promotion to Holy Orders.⁵ Other canons are aimed at paganism. No. 2 adopts the fatal policy of force, and entreats the Emperors for the destruction of its temples.⁶ No. 4 asks for the suppression of pagan festivals, with their licentious dancing.⁷ Others, again, touch upon questions social or moral. No plays, it is requested by No. 5, are to be exhibited on Sundays and holy-days.⁸ No. 7 would forbid actors, if converted to Christ, to be forced back to their profession.⁹ No. 8 petitions the Emperors to grant to Africa also the right of emancipating slaves in church.¹⁰ The sixth African Council,¹¹ of 13 September, returns to the problem of Donatism in the first three of its nineteen enactments. Aurelius, having read aloud a letter from Pope Anastasius in which he urged the African episcopate to

¹ F. W. Puller, *The anointing of the sick*, 53-61.

² Mansi, iii. 1023; Hefele, ii. 421-3; Fleury, xxi. xiii.

³ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. lvi (Mansi, iii. 763 A); *Mon. vet.*, No. xii (Optatus, *Op.* 210; *P. L.* xi. 1195 sq.).

⁴ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, Nos. lvi-lxv (Mansi, iii. 763-70); Hefele, ii. 422 sq.

⁵ No. lvii, and *Mon. vet.*, No. xii.

⁶ No. lviii. The canon is interesting, as showing where paganism found its last refuge.

⁷ No. lx.

⁸ No. lxi.

⁹ No. lxiii.

¹⁰ No. lxiv.

¹¹ Mansi, iii. 1023; Hefele, ii. 423-6; *Mon. vet.* xiii (Optatus, *Op.* 211; *P. L.* xi. 1197-9).

stand firm in its conflict with the Donatists,¹ the Synod, by its first canon, resolved that they should be dealt with 'gently'.² The secular judges, however, should be asked, in places where the Maximianists had got possession of the churches, to inquire precisely what took place at the time of their schism from the main body under Primian, and to prepare authentic minutes thereof.³ In the second canon the Synod resolved to recognize the status of such Donatist clergy as might conform⁴; and, by the third, to send representatives to Donatist bishops and dioceses in communion with Primian and explain that they have no grievance against Catholics, who have only treated them as they themselves treated their own schismatics of the party of Maximian: condemning, indeed, their schism but, on the other hand, receiving individuals and recognizing their baptism.⁵ Towards the end of the year Augustine set out the principle of this legislation in his sixty-first letter, where he puts the attitude of Catholic to Donatist in a nutshell. He would receive 'all the good things they had of God—baptism, ordination, continence, virginity, faith in the Trinity and so forth. . . . When therefore they return to the Catholic Church, they do not receive from her what they had before; but they receive from the Church what they had not, viz. charity, which makes what they had of benefit to them.'⁶

§ 5. But neither argument nor the intervention of the magistrates took much effect; and Donatist intransigence only began to give way before the policy of union imposed under the governorship of Bathanarius,⁷ Count of Africa 401–†8. He was brother-in-law to Stilicho; and the Court could therefore be counted on by the Church till the murder of Stilicho, 23 August 408, and the disgrace of his family. For the Government, so long as his power lasted, would not be likely to forget the support given by the Donatists to Gildo whose rebellion Stilicho had suppressed.

¹ Mansi, iii. 770 sq.; *Mon. vet.* xiii (Opt. Op. 211; P. L. xi. 1197 D).

² No. lxvi (Mansi, iii. 771 B); *Mon. vet.* xiii (Opt. Op. 211; P. L. xi. 1198 A).

³ No. lxvii (Mansi, iii. 771 C, D); *Mon. vet.* xiii (Opt. Op. 211; P. L. xi. 1198 B). The schism took place 392; Maximianists to the E. of Carthage; Primianists in Numidia and Mauretania.

⁴ No. lxviii (Mansi, iii. 771–4); *Mon. vet.* xiii (Opt. Op. 211; P. L. xi. 1198 C).

⁵ No. lxix (Mansi, iii. 774 C, D); *Mon. vet.* xiii (Opt. Op. 211; P. L. xi. 1199).

⁶ *Ep.* lxi, § 2 (Op. ii. 149; P. L. xxxiii. 229), and Document No. 172.

⁷ The Counts of Africa under Honorius were Gildo, 393–8, Gaudentius, 398–401, Bathanarius, 401–†8, Heraclian, 408–†13, Marinus, 413–14. For Bathanarius, see Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 525; Hodgkin, i. ii. 760.

(1) The first expedient was that of a Conference; for after a Seventh African Council,¹ of minor importance, on 27 August 402, at Mileve in Numidia, it was resolved by the Eighth African Council, of 24 August 403, at Carthage, to try a new method of conciliation.² Not content now merely to leave the door open to Donatists willing to return to the Church, the Council proposed to treat with their hierarchy direct, and invite them to a Conference where the two episcopates might discuss their differences on equal terms. But the Donatists were difficult of approach; and recourse was therefore had to the local authorities as intermediaries. Each bishop, armed with a letter from the Proconsul or the Vicar of Africa, was to present himself to the magistrates of the town and get the letter inserted into the municipal *acta*, together with a form of summons to a Conference; that done, he was to retire. The magistrate would then read the minutes of these proceedings to the Donatist bishop and his clergy. But the Donatists took no more notice of the civil authority than of their ecclesiastical rivals. Witness the reply of Primian, their primate, as it appears on the municipal records of Carthage. 'It would be a shameful thing', said he, 'for the sons of Martyrs to meet the offspring of Traditors.'³ . . . 'They bring with them the letters of many Emperors. We rely only on the Gospels. . . . The true Church is that which suffers persecution, not that which persecutes.'⁴ In Numidia the Donatist bishops sent a collective refusal⁵; and the project of a Conference fell through. The refusal, moreover, was reinforced by violence: Crispinus, for example, the Donatist rival of Possidius, bishop of Calama, refused the summons of the latter; and suffered his relative, a presbyter also named Crispinus, to attack and maltreat Possidius when on a visitation-tour,⁶ 404.

¹ Mansi, iii. 1139; *Mon. vet.* xiv (*Opt. Op.* 212; *P. L.* xi. 1199); Hefele, ii. 427; Fleury, xxi. xxv, and *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, Nos. lxxxvi-xc (Mansi, iii. 783-7). Note c. lxxxvi for the 'matricula' of consecrations to be kept by the Primate who, in Numidia and Mauretania Sitifensis, was the senior by consecration.

² Mansi, iii. 1155; Hefele, ii. 439; Fleury, xxi. xxvi. For its canons, see *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* xci, xcii (Mansi iii. 787-94; *Mon. vet.* xv, xvi; *Opt. Op.* 212 sq. [*P. L.* xi. 1200 sqq.]).

³ Aug. *Ad Don. post Coll.*, § 39 (*Op.* ix. 604 a; *P. L.* xliii. 676).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 53 (*Op.* ix. 612; *P. L.* xliii. 684).

⁵ *Contra Cresc.* iii, § 49 (*Op.* ix. 460 E; *P. L.* xliii. 523); *Ep.* cv, § 13 (*Op.* ii. 301 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 401).

⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 50, 51 (*Op.* ix. 460 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 523 sq.); *Ep.* cv, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 297 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 397); Possidius, *Vita*, § 12 (*Op.* x, app. 264; *P. L.* xxxii. 43).

The Circumcellions also, whom Augustine describes as 'the teeth and heels'¹ of their party, broke out into fresh fury. They waylaid Augustine himself, but unsuccessfully. For he happened, that day, to take the wrong road to his destination, and they were on the road he should have taken.² They made brutal attacks on two other Catholic bishops of Numidia³: Servus of Tubursica and Maximian of Bagai. The latter they seized at his altar, and beat him so unmercifully with the fragments of it (for, like an altar at Alexandria which Athanasius mentions,⁴ it was of wood) that he was nearly killed.

(2) With such opponents conference was impossible; and the Catholic episcopate determined next to make an appeal to the civil power. On 16 June 404 the Ninth African Council,⁵ at Carthage, resolved to invoke the assistance of the Emperor against the violence of the Donatists. Some of the older bishops were for demanding the absolute prohibition of Donatism as a heresy. They pointed to the success which had attended the policy of 'compelling them to come in', notably at Augustine's own birth-place, Tagaste; where, in the time of Macarius, 347-8, the people had been forcibly reconverted to the Catholic Church, and had never since left it. But Augustine, as yet, was against the use of force⁶; and the Council contented itself with asking for protection.⁷ Its deputies, Theasius and Evodius, were instructed⁸ to say that, instead of accepting the conferences proposed in the previous year, the Donatists had indulged in all kinds of outrage. Let the magistrates therefore be directed to render assistance to the Catholics; let the law of Theodosius, *In haereticis erroribus*,⁹ of 15 January 392, by which he forbade heretics to ordain under penalty of a fine of ten pounds of gold, be enforced against all who assault Catholics;

¹ *Contra Cresc.* iii, § 69 (*Op.* ix. 470 F; *P. L.* xliii. 534). They attacked the social order, *Ep.* clxxxv, § 15 (*Op.* ii. 649; *P. L.* xxxiii. 719).

² Possidius, *Vita*, § 12 (*Op.* x, app. 264; *P. L.* xxxii. 43); *Enchiridion*, § 5 (*Op.* vi. 201 E; *P. L.* xl. 239).

³ *Contra Cresc.* iii, § 47 (*Op.* ix. 458; *P. L.* xliii. 521); *Ep.* clxxxv, § 27 (*Op.* ii. 654; *P. L.* xxxiii. 805).

⁴ *Hist. Ar.*, § 56 (*Op.* i. 298; *P. G.* xxv. 760 D). On the material of altars, see Bingham, *Ant.* viii. vi, §§ 12, 15; Fleury, xxii. vii (ii. 129, note k).

⁵ Mansi, iii. 1159; Hefele, ii. 440; *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. xciii in Mansi, iii. 794-8, or *Mon. Vet.*, No. xvii (*Opt. Op.* 214; *P. L.* xi. 1202-4).

⁶ *Aug. Ep.* xciii [A. D. 408], §§ 16, 17 (*Op.* ii. 237 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 329 sq.), and Document No. 175.

⁷ *Ep.* clxxxv [A. D. 417], § 25 (*Op.* ii. 653 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 804).

⁸ See their Instructions or 'Commonitorium' in *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. xciii, *ut sup.*

⁹ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 21.

and let *Si quis Manichaeus*¹ of 8 May 381, by which he disqualified heretics from testamentary rights, be applicable to all who shall persist in remaining Donatists. But, before Theasius and Evodius reached the Court, Honorius had granted more than they were instructed to ask. For Servus and Maximian and others, who had been half-killed by the brutality of the Circumcellions, had reached Ravenna before them. Showing their wounds,² they excited such indignation against the Donatists that the Emperor determined upon drastic measures.

(3) He renewed the policy of union, formerly so successful in the hands of Paul and Macarius, the *operarii unitatis* of 347-8. A law, now lost but implied by the legislation of the spring of 405, was promulgated³ suppressing the Donatist sect; banishing their bishops and clergy; and handing over their churches to the Catholic hierarchy. Then followed *Nemo Manichaeum*⁴ of 12 February 405. 'We will hear no more', said Honorius, 'of Manichees, or Donatists. There shall be but one religion, the Catholic.' It was known as the Edict of Union⁵; and it was followed up by rescripts enjoining it specially on Africa,⁶ and by other enactments,⁷ several of the same date as the Edict,⁸ intended to regulate details.⁹ The Edict was rightly so called; for, on the whole, it had the effect of promoting reunion. Donatists, under it, were united with Catholics in 'one religion'; and schism was now penal. In Carthage, at any rate, there were many who rallied to the Church, glad to escape from extreme positions with which they did not sympathize, from the pressure of family traditions, or from actual terrorism.¹⁰ The Edict of Union must, indeed, take rank with other persecuting edicts; but the adversaries whom it smote being the implacable and contemptuous sectaries that Donatists were, there is this much to be said for it, that it delivered as many consciences as it enthralled. It is therefore no matter for

¹ Ibid. xvi. v. 7.

² Aug. *Ep.* lxxxviii, § 7 (*Op.* ii. 217 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 306).

³ *Ep.* clxxxv, § 26 (*Op.* ii. 654; *P. L.* xxxiii. 805 sq.); Fleury, xxii. vii.

⁴ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 38; Fleury, xxii. viii.

⁵ *Edictum quod de Unitate*, 5 March 405, *Cod. Theod.* xvi. xi. 2.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 37 of 25 Feb. 405; xvi. v. 39 of 8 Dec. 405, both to Proconsul of Africa.

⁸ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. vi. 3, 4, 5; to Hadrian, P.-P. of Italy.

⁹ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 40, 41, 43; of 407.

¹⁰ Aug. *Epp.* clxxxv, § 29, xciii, § 18 (*Op.* ii. 655 E, 238; *P. L.* xxxiii. 806, 330).

surprise that the Tenth African Council,¹ 23 August 405, welcomed the new Imperial policy. It resolved that letters should be written to the magistrates of Africa exhorting them all to be as loyal in the execution of the Edict of Union as were their colleagues in Carthage; and that a deputation should wait upon Honorius to thank him for 'the extinction' of Donatism. But in Numidia results were not so happy. The effect of the Edict there was to exasperate Donatist fanaticism. At Hippo, in 406, the Catholic clergy were reduced to writing to the Donatist bishop to ask his protection from the fury of Circumcellions who had seized some of their number and poured lime and vinegar into their eyes to blind them.² At Bagai the Donatists burnt the Catholic church³: and there were similar outrages at Cirta⁴; in Setif,⁵ the capital of Mauretania Sitifensis; and in other places. One Donatist bishop boasted that he had burnt four Catholic churches with his own hands.⁶ Yet, by 408, some measure of order had been restored. On the fall of Stilicho and the murder of his brother-in-law Bathanarius,⁷ the Donatists thought, for a moment, that their release had come.⁸ But power passed forthwith into the hands of Stilicho's betrayer, Olympius: a correspondent of Augustine's⁹ whose character, perhaps, he rated too high,¹⁰ but a Catholic. He became Master of the Offices, 14 November 408; and the anti-Donatist legislation was at once confirmed, in a rescript¹¹ of 24 November, addressed to Donatus, Proconsul of Africa, 408-10, to whom Augustine wrote a letter of intercession for the Donatists, praying that he would coerce them but not put them to death.¹² In 409 Olympius had to make way for the pagan Jovius. An edict of toleration was obtained; and it began to look as if the results of the Union were to be jeopardized. But the African Episcopate, from the eleventh to the thirteenth African Councils, 407-8, had been on the watch. The

¹ Mansi, iii. 1159; *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* xciv (ib. iii. 799); *Mon. vet.* xxii (Opt. Op. 219; *P. L.* xi. 1211 sq.); Hefele, ii. 441.

² Aug. *Epp.* lxxxviii, § 8, cxi, § 1 (Op. ii. 217 D, 319 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 307, 422); and *Contra Cresc.* iii, § 46 (Op. ix. 458; *P. L.* xliii. 521).

³ *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 23 (Op. ix. 566 E; *P. L.* xliii. 636).

⁴ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 139 (Mansi, iv. 123 c; Opt. Op. 275 [*P. L.* xi. 1316]).

⁵ Ibid. i, § 143 (Mansi, iv. 125 A; Opt. Op. 275 [*P. L.* xi. 1318 A]).

⁶ Ibid. i, § 201 (Mansi, iv. 151 B; Opt. Op. 284 [*P. L.* xi. 1339 B]).

⁷ Gibbon, c. xxx (iii. 279 sqq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 756-60.

⁸ Aug. *Epp.* xcvi, § 2, c, § 2 (Op. ii. 262, 270 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 358, 367).

⁹ *Epp.* xcvi, xcvi (Op. ii. 260-3; *P. L.* xxxiii. 356-9).

¹⁰ Zosimus (*Hist.* v, § 32) speaks ill of him; but Zosimus was a heathen.

¹¹ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 44.

¹² *Ep.* c, § 1 (Op. ii. 270 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 366). Then followed, 15 January 409, *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 46.

eleventh,¹ which met at Carthage, 13 June 407, among its twelve canons, had petitioned by c. 2 for five *executores* or *exactores* to collect the revenues of the Church²; and, by c. 3, for advocates—known in the West as *Defensores Ecclesiae*³ and in the East as Ἐκδικοί⁴—to keep the magistrates to their duty of protecting it. And we may, in passing, note an interesting enactment, of c. 9, to the effect that only such forms of prayer shall be used as have been examined by the Synod and compiled by enlightened persons.⁵ It was aimed at ignorant bishops who declined to be guided, in the exercise of their *liturgicum*,⁶ by the considered opinion of experts. On 14 June 410 the fifteenth African Council⁷ sent Possidius and others as a deputation to the Court at Ravenna to procure the withdrawal of the edict of toleration; and, on the day after Alaric entered Rome, they obtained a new edict, *Oraculo penitus*,⁸ of 25 August 410, which was addressed to Heraclian, Count of Africa 408–†13, and once more established the policy of Union by repression.

§ 6. Repression had been proved to be the only method so far successful in the cause of peace and good order; and we cannot wonder, though we must profoundly regret, that Augustine was at last won over to give it his countenance. It was a step not less disastrous in the after-history of the Church than the conversion of Constantine. The Fathers, as a whole, were on the side of toleration.⁹ Some, indeed, had condemned persecution when they were themselves its victims, as Hilary of Poitiers.¹⁰ Others condemned it on principle, e.g. Athanasius¹¹ and Chrysostom.¹² Others again, as Martin, Ambrose, and Siricius, raised loud protests against it when they were neither in doctrinal sympathy with Priscillian, its victim, nor in any danger themselves. And Augustine,

¹ Mansi, iii. 1163; *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* xc–cvi (ibid. 799–810); Hefele, ii. 442; Fleury, xxii. xiv.

² No. xcvi (Mansi, iii. 802 B).

³ No. xcvi (Mansi, iii. 802 C). The request was granted, 15 November 407, by *Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 38, together with *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 41, of the same date, suppressing Donatism. For the office of *Defensores*, see J. Bingham, *Ant.* iii. xi, §§ 3–5; Fleury, xxii. xiv, note p; W. Bright, *Canons* 2, 147.

⁴ Chalc. 2 (ib. xxxix). ⁵ No. ciii (Mansi, iii. 807 A); cf. Hippo, c. 21.

⁶ On which, see J. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace* 2, 169–71.

⁷ No. cvii (Mansi, iii. 810 D); Hefele, ii. 444; Fleury, xxii. xxvi.

⁸ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 51.

⁹ The ante-Nicenes (e.g. Tert. *Apol.* xxiv; Cyprian, *Ep.* liv, § 3), as might be expected, denounced persecution: see M. Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, 72 sq.

¹⁰ Hilary, *Ad. Const. Aug.* i, § 6 (*Op.* ii. 538 sq.; *P. L.* x. 561 A).

¹¹ Ath. *Apol. de fuga*, § 23 (*Op.* i. 264; *P. G.* xxv. 673).

¹² Chr. *De Sacerdotio*, ii, § 4 (*Op.* i. 375 C; *P. G.* xlviii. 635).

as we have seen, was averse to it, and all for persuasion only, at first. 'No one should be forced into union with Christ,' he had said: 'the result would only be that, instead of open heretics, we should have sham Catholics.'¹ But he yielded before the practical good that came, as he could not but see, from the penal legislation of Honorius. About 408 we find him writing that, while he disliked extreme severities, he thought moderate measures were good.² He yielded to a fatal principle. It was fatal to Augustine himself: for he misuses 'Compel them to come in'³; and, in his defence of penal laws, becomes involved in a strange confusion between providential and merely human penalties, and between moral and physical pressure.⁴ It was no less fatal to the honour of his name. The name of Augustine was, in after days, of great, and almost final, authority. 'A sermon without Augustine', ran the Spanish proverb, 'is as a stew without bacon.'⁵ To think then that that great name could be pleaded in so bad a cause! and that the question between Augustine and later persecutors was not one of principle but only of its application. The severities used towards the Huguenots in the dragonnades of Louis XIV, 1643-†1715, were justified simply by reference to Augustine.⁶ The other Augustine, 597-†601, gave better expression to the fundamental principle of the Gospel, when he advised Ethelbert, after his baptism, to 'compel' none of his subjects 'to become a Christian: the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, not compulsory'.⁷ And Innocent XI, 1676-†89, reaffirmed this principle when he remonstrated with Louis and told him that 'a man ought to be drawn and not dragged to the temple of the Lord'.⁸ But it would be most unjust to forget the conditions under which Augustine and his generation were, in the first instance, led to abandon their original principle of toleration in favour of penal laws; and we have to make allowance for two factors all but incomprehensible to us—the irreconcilable temper of Donatism, and the sanctity

¹ *Ep.* xciii, § 17 (*Op.* ii. 237; *P. L.* xxxiii. 329 sq.), and Document No. 175

² 'Corrigi eos cupimus, non necari,' *Ep.* c, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 270 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 366).

³ Luke xiv. 23: for the argument built on it, see W. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism in Europe*, c. iv.

⁴ *Ep.* xciii, § 5 (*Op.* ii. 233; *P. L.* xxxiii. 323); clxxxv, § 24 (*Op.* ii. 653; *P. L.* xxxiii. 804).

⁵ R. C. Trench, *Proverbs and their lessons*¹⁰, 65.

⁶ W. H. Jervis, *Hist. Ch. France*, ii. 64 sqq.; E. Lavisse et A. Rambaud, *Hist. Générale*, vi, c. 7.

⁷ Bede, *H. E.* i. 26.

⁸ L. von Ranke, *Hist. Popes*, ii. 422 (ed. Bohn).

which, under Caesarism, attached to the 'Celestial Oracles',¹ or edicts, of the Augustus. It is in the *Contra Cresconium*, written about 406, that Augustine refers to the worst outrage, that on Maximian of Bagai, which called forth the edicts²; and accepts, as if it could scarcely be otherwise, the recent legislation to which it gave rise. But on 14 June 410, at the fifteenth African Council, held in Carthage, the episcopate resolved, while sending the deputation to procure the withdrawal of the edict of toleration, to try once more what could be done by discussion.³

§ 7. On 14 October 410 they obtained a rescript from Honorius⁴ for the Conference of Carthage,⁵ 411.

(1) Marcellinus,⁶ 'a tribune and notary',⁷ i.e. of the class of dignitaries regularly charged with the execution of Imperial mandates, was to conduct it as High Commissioner. He landed in Africa, and took time to study the situation; for, being a devout Catholic and a friend of Augustine, he was anxious to let it be seen that he intended to hold the balance equal between the contending parties. He even went so far, in consideration for the Donatists as, in his proclamation of February 411, explanatory of the Imperial rescript, to modify its tone in their favour. The bishops, he says, Catholic and Donatist, are summoned to meet at Carthage within four months from date, i.e. by the first of June. Magistrates are to call their attention to the summons. If the Donatists accept the invitation, they are to be put into possession again of any churches from which they may have been evicted, in order that, the *status quo ante* being renewed, the discussion might begin on fair terms. If they doubt the High Commissioner's impartiality on the ground that he is a Catholic, he will be glad to accept an assessor of their own persuasion; and he promises them a safe-conduct not only to Carthage but back to their homes.⁸

¹ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 4 (*Opt. Op.* 246; *P. L.* xi. 1260 B).

² *Contra Cresc.* iii, §§ 47, 51 (*Op.* ix. 458-62; *P. L.* xliii. 522, 525); Fleury, xxii. viii.

³ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* cvii (Mansi, iii. 810 D).

⁴ q.v. in *Gest. Coll.* i, § 4 (Mansi, iv. 53 sq.; *Opt. Op.* 246 sq. [*P. L.* xi. 1260 sq.]). It contains *Ea quae*, the rescript in question; the whole being addressed to Marcellinus, as his commission to preside at the Conference.

⁵ On which see the *Gesta Collationis* in Mansi, iv. 7-286, or in *Opt. Op.* 225-332 (*P. L.* xi. 1223-1433); Tillemont, *Mém.* vi. 188-91, xiii. 499-504, 516-61; Fleury, xxii. xxviii-xl; and Augustine's *resumé* of the *Gesta* in his *Breviculus Collationis*, written c. 411 (*Op.* ix. 545-80; *P. L.* xliii. 613-50).

⁶ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 501-3.

⁷ Fleury, xxii. xxvi, note z.

⁸ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 5 (Mansi, iv. 54-6; *Opt. Op.* 247 sq. [*P. L.* xi. 1261 sq.]); *Excerpta ad Don. Hist. pert.* in *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 50 sq. [*P. L.* xliii. 817-19]); Fleury, xxii. xxviii, and *Brev. Coll.* i, § 2 (*Op.* ix. 545; *P. L.* xliii. 614).

(2) The Donatist bishops accepted the invitation ; and, by way of impressing their strength upon the public mind, entered Carthage, in a body, 18 May,¹ to the number of two hundred and seventy-nine. The Catholics numbered two hundred and eighty-six.² When all had arrived, the High Commissioner issued a second order in which he fixed the date and the place of meeting, 1 June, in the Baths of Gargilius. Each party was to choose seven representatives to address the Conference, seven more as counsel, and four, besides, to superintend the officials of his Commission who were to take the minutes. No one but these eighteen on either side was to be admitted. All the bishops of either side were to declare in writing, before the discussion opened, that they would be bound by whatever their deputies did in their name. They were also to admonish their people in sermons to keep the peace. The Maximianists were not to be admitted ; and the Primate of each party, Catholic and Donatist, were to give the Commissioner guarantees, under their sign manual, from all its members that they accepted his order in every detail.³ These guarantees the Donatists handed in, 25 May, under the signatures of their two Primate, Januarian, bishop of Casae Nigrae, and Primian, bishop of Carthage⁴ : while the Catholics complied by a letter subscribed in the name of all, by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage and Primate of Africa, and Silvanus, bishop of Summa and Primate of Numidia.⁵ ' If the Donatists are converted,' they add, ' and induced to join the Church, the Catholic and Donatist bishops shall occupy the throne by turns ; no innovation, for it has prevailed in Africa from the first, in the case of episcopal converts from schism. But if the people are scandalized at there being two bishops allowed in one place, then both shall resign and a third be elected.'⁶ It was the most memorable thing in connexion with the Conference ; and their efforts after peace were well seconded by two sermons⁷ of

¹ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 14 (Mansi, iv. 60 B ; *Opt. Op.* 249 [*P. L.* xi. 1266 c] ; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 52 a [*P. L.* xliii. 821]).

² *Brev. Coll.* i, § 14 (*Op.* ix. 550 F ; *P. L.* xliii. 620).

³ *Gesta Coll.* i, § 10 (Mansi, iv. 57-9 ; *Opt. Op.* 248 sq. [*P. L.* xi. 1263-6] ; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 51 sq. [*P. L.* xliii. 819-21]) ; Fleury, xxii. xxviii.

⁴ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 14, *ut sup.* ; *Brev. Coll.* i, § 4 (*Op.* ix. 545 sq. ; *P. L.* xliii. 615).

⁵ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 16 (Mansi, iv. 61-3 ; *Opt. Op.* 249 [*P. L.* xi. 1267] ; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 53 c [*P. L.* xliii. 821]) ; Fleury, xxii. xxix.

⁶ *Aug. Ep.* cxxviii, § 3 (*Op.* ii. 378 E ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 489) ; *Brev. Coll.* i, § 5 (*Op.* ix. 546 ; *P. L.* xliii. 615).

⁷ *Serm.* ccclvii, ccclviii (*Op.* v. 1391-8 ; *P. L.* xxxix. 1582-90).

Augustine, preached to the Catholics, in view of the arrival of the Donatists, during the Whitsuntide Ember Days,¹ 17–20 May, on the blessedness of the peacemakers. ‘Don’t say, when you see the Donatist rival of your bishop coming, “I can’t stand So-and-so, because he slanders my bishop.” The best service you can do your bishop just now, is *not* to take up and defend his cause. You would like, however, just to tell the fellow your mind? Well: I don’t say, “Besilent”, but “Speak: only not *to* him, but to God *for* him”.’²

(3) On 1 June 411, the day appointed, Marcellinus and his suite took their places in the great hall of the Baths of Gargilius³; and the bishops, eighteen for either side, were ushered in.⁴ The seven Catholic disputants⁵ were headed by Aurelius the Primate, Augustine and his two friends, Alypius of Tagaste and Possidius of Calama. The chief representatives of the Donatists⁶ were Primian, their Primate at Carthage, the violent Petilian of Cirta in Numidia, the voluble Emeritus of Caesarea in Mauretania, and the fanatical Gaudentius of Tamugada in the heart of the country of the Circumcellions, and, like Bagai, one of the strongholds of Donatism. The Donatists declined the invitation of the High Commissioner to be seated.⁷ ‘I have hated the congregation of the wicked,’ they said, ‘and will not sit among the ungodly.’ So Marcellinus announced, with no less tact than courtesy, that he would stand too⁸; and for eleven hours, during the whole of a long summer-day, the Court was held, all standing. But the day was wasted in preliminaries, for the Donatists were bent on obstruction. All the bishops on either side had to be challenged, 266 Catholic⁹ and

¹ *Serm.* ccelvii, § 5 (*Op.* v. 1394 F; *P. L.* xxxix. 1585).

² *Ibid.*, § 4 (*Op.* v. 1393 G; *P. L.* xxxix. 1584).

³ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 1 (Mansi, iv. 51 c; *Opt. Op.* 246 [*P. L.* xi. 1257]).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 2 (Mansi, iv. 52 sq.; *Opt. Op.* 246 [*P. L.* xi. 1259]); Fleury, xxii. xxxii.

⁵ Chosen, 30 May, and nominated in the *Mandatum Catholicorum*: *Gest. Coll.* i, § 55 (Mansi, iv. 74–80, *ad fin.*; *Opt. Op.* 256 [*P. L.* xi. 1273 A]; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 53–8 [*P. L.* xliii. 821–7]); Fleury, xxii. xxxi. It is a lengthy document, and important, for in it the Catholic bishops give a summary of their argument both as to the question of principle and as to the question of fact. See also *Brev. Coll.* i, § 10 (*Op.* ix. 548 D; *P. L.* xliii. 617).

⁶ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 148 (Mansi, iv. 128; *Opt. Op.* 276 [*P. L.* xi. 1320 B]); 25 May.

⁷ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 144 (Mansi, iv. 126 c; *Opt. Op.* 276 [*P. L.* xi. 1319 A]).

⁸ *Gest. Coll.* ii, §§ 3–5 (Mansi, iv. 168; *Opt. Op.* 290 [*P. L.* xi. 1353 sq.]); *Brev. Coll.* ii, § 1 (*Op.* ix. 551 D; *P. L.* xliii. 521).

⁹ The number of signatories to the *Mandatum Catholicorum* of 30 May *Gest. Coll.* i, § 58 (Mansi, iv. 81 B; *Opt. Op.* 276 [*P. L.* xi. 1273 c]): see also § 214.

279 Donatist¹—a wearisome business² for them, but out of it emerges a situation of interest to us. Reckoning 120 absentees and 64 sees vacant, the Catholic episcopate of Africa then had a total of 470 prelates; the Donatist returns, though not so complete, point to a figure not much less. It was ‘the eleventh hour’³ by the time that these tiresome formalities were over; and the Conference adjourned, according to the interval required by the president for the transcribing of the minutes, till the next day but one; but this second meeting, of 3 June, was wasted over other details.⁴ Not till 8 June was the Conference resumed. At first, it looked as if mere obstruction would once more triumph; for the Donatists insisted on raising questions as to which side was plaintiff and which defendant,⁵ and which had the right to the description ‘Catholic’.⁶ But, in the course of the discussion the Donatists, at last, were brought to the main point, and put in a document which they had been preparing since the first session.⁷ It was in answer to the instructions⁸ given by the Catholic episcopate to its delegates at the first meeting; and, as these instructions recited both the Scriptural passages⁹ on which the Catholic theory of the Church rested and the various instruments, back to the days of Constantine, by which they claimed that the facts as well were on their side,¹⁰ the controversy was, at last, to be taken on its merits. Augustine who, so far, had scarcely opened his mouth, now took the lead. For he forced his opponents to face the question of principle, and to examine the arguments from Holy Writ which represents the Church not as a select community of saintly persons but as a mixed society in which, till the Final Judgement, ‘the

¹ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 213 (Mansi, iv. 163 c; *Opt. Op.* 288 [*P. L.* xi. 1350 A]).

² Described in *Gest. Coll.* i, §§ 99 sqq.; (*Opt. Op.* 260 sqq. [*P. L.* xi. 1280 sqq.]); and *Brev. Coll.* i, §§ 12, 14 (*Aug. Op.* ix. 549 sqq.; *P. L.* xliii. 618 sqq.).

³ *Gest. Coll.* i, § 219 (Mansi, iv. 164 A; *Opt. Op.* 289 [*P. L.* xi. 1352 A]).

⁴ *Gest. Coll.* ii (Mansi, iv. 167–82; *Opt. Op.* 290–4 [*P. L.* xi. 1353–63]).

⁵ *Gest. Coll.* iii, §§ 15 sqq. (Mansi, iv. 184 sq.; *Opt. Op.* 295 [*P. L.* xi. 1365 sq.]).

⁶ *Gest. Coll.* iii, §§ 22 sqq. (Mansi, iv. 185; *Opt. Op.* 295 sq. [*P. L.* xi. 1366]); and *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 3 (*Op.* ix. 554 c; *P. L.* xliii. 623).

⁷ *Gest. Coll.* iii, § 258 (Mansi, iv. 235–41; *Opt. Op.* 313–15 [*P. L.* xi. 1408–14]; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 64–7 [*P. L.* xliii. 834–8]); *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 10 (*Op.* ix. 558 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 628); Fleury, xxii. xxxviii.

⁸ *Mandatum Catholicorum* in *Gest. Coll.* i, § 55, *ut sup.*

⁹ i. e. ‘The Wheat and the Tares, the Threshing-floor, the Sheep and the Goats, The Net, *ibid.*, § 4 (*Aug. Op.* ix, app. 55 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 824).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 6 (app. 57 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 826 sq.).

evil be ever mingled with the good'.¹ If that be so, he argued, whatever the merits or demerits of Caecilian and his consecrator, Felix, their guilt affected no one but themselves. It could not prevent the Church from being the Church.² The discussion then naturally turned to the question of fact³; and the documents relating to Caecilian, from the time of Constantine onwards,⁴ on which the Catholics had customarily based their defence, were read and considered. So also were those which the Donatists held to make for their contention. But these latter were shown to be but few, and were found, on examination, as in the case of the records of the Council of Cirta,⁵ 4 March 305, to make against them. Supposing Caecilian was condemned by the Council of Carthage, 312, to which the Donatists assigned so much importance, no more prejudice ought thence to attach to him than should ensue to Primian who was condemned in absence by a Council of Maximianists at Cabarsussi, 393: precisely as Caecilian had been condemned, while absent, by the partisans of Majorinus. 'Ah! but', said one of the Donatist spokesmen somewhat incautiously, 'the affair of one man does not in any way affect the case of another.' But this was the standing contention of the Catholics, so far as the question of principle went. Let the crimes alleged against Caecilian be proved to have been what they may, yet this would in no way have affected his successors and the bishops of Africa; still less, the Universal Church.⁶ It was then substantially shown, by the reading of further records, that Felix had been cleared and that, in one court after another, Caecilian had been acquitted; till at last, the definitive sentence of Constantine, 316, had finally pronounced him innocent.⁷ Marcellinus, at length, declared the discussion at an end; and directed the bishops to withdraw till he had drafted his decision. It was night by the time that he was ready to read it; and lights were brought in before the bishops

¹ *Gest. Coll.* iii, § 261 (*Opt. Op.* 316; *P. L.* xi. 1414 c), 'Quaestio de ecclesia,' &c., Document No. 126; *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 68 B (*P. L.* xliii. 838 sq.). The *Gesta* break off in the middle of the argument; and, for the remainder, recourse must be had to *Brev. Coll.* iii, §§ 15, 16 (*Op.* ix. 562 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 631 sq.).

² *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 23 (*Op.* ix. 566 a; *P. L.* xliii. 637).

³ *Brev. Coll.* iii, §§ 24-42 (*Op.* ix. 567-79; *P. L.* xliii. 637-50).

⁴ Beginning with the Report of Anulinus in 313, Documents, i, No. 217.

⁵ Documents, i, No. 216.

⁶ *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 28 (*Op.* ix. 570 E; *P. L.* xliii. 641).

⁷ See the documents connected with the five investigations in Documents, i, Nos. 191, 199, 218, 200, 201, 219, 198.

re-entered. The High Commissioner then delivered judgement in favour of the Catholics on every count.¹

(4) On 26 June he supplemented it by an edict,² not now as judge but as the executive officer charged by the Emperor to carry his sentence into effect. As no one ought to be condemned, he begins, for the faults of another, the misdeeds of Caecilian, had they been proved, could not have affected the Universal Church; but it had been proved that Donatus was the author of the schism, and that both Caecilian, and his consecrator, Felix, were blameless. Magistrates, proprietors, and tenants, therefore, are to put an end to Donatist meetings for worship, in cities and on their estates. Churches, temporarily restored to the Donatists, are to be handed over to the Catholics. All Donatists who refuse to join the Church shall be subject to the rigour of the law; their bishops, for the better execution of this edict, are to return home at once; and lands, where Circumcellions are reported, shall be immediately forfeit. There was an appeal, of course, from this edict, by the Donatists; but it resulted only in their final condemnation. By *Cassatis quae*³ of 30 January 412, Honorius annulled all rescripts that they might have obtained in their favour, and confirmed all former laws by which they had been condemned. Freemen were to be fined, and slaves to be beaten. Their clergy were to be deported, and their churches restored to the Catholics. It was the death-blow to Donatism. Marcellinus, indeed, was involved in the overthrow⁴ of his friend Heraclian, and was put to death,⁵ 13 September 413, by Marinus now Count of Africa, 413-14. The hopes of the Donatists rose once more. But Marinus was soon superseded⁶; and edicts, confirmatory of the measures of repression⁷ as of the official minutes of the Conference,⁸ dashed them again; while, in place of Marcellinus, another Commissioner, Dulcitius, was appointed to enforce the union. Donatist bishops and their flocks came over in crowds.⁹

¹ *Brev. Coll.* iii, § 43 (*Op.* ix. 579 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 650).

² For the *Sententia Cognitoris* in *Gest. Coll.*, *ad fin.* (*Opt. Op.* 317; *P. L.* xi. 1418-20); or *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 69 sq. (*P. L.* xliii. 840 sq.); Fleury, xxii. xl.

³ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 52, and *Aug. Op.* ix, app. 70 sq. (*P. L.* xliii. 841 sq.).

⁴ Gibbon, c. xxxi (iii. 338 sq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 828.

⁵ Jerome, *Dial. adv. Pel.* iii, § 19 (*Op.* ii. 804; *P. L.* xxiii. 588 c); *Aug. Ep.* cli, § 3 (*Op.* ii. 518 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 617); Fleury, xxiii. xi.

⁶ Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 42 (*Op.* 583; *P. L.* xxxi. 1171 B).

⁷ 17 June 414; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 54.

⁸ 30 August 414; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 55.

⁹ Possidius, *Vita*, § 13 (*Op.* x, app. 265 sq.; *P. L.* xxxii. 44).

§ 8. It only remains to notice the literature of the last crisis of Donatism.

(1) The edicts provoked a fresh outbreak of Circumcellion fury in which Restitutus, a priest of Hippo, was murdered¹; and Innocent, another cleric, suffered mutilation.² The ringleaders were brought before Marcellinus, 412. He extorted a confession from them but used no 'tortures properly so called, such as fire, iron hooks, or the 'Little Horse', but only the scourge which, as St. Augustine observes, 'is used by teachers of the liberal arts, by parents, and often by bishops themselves in the administration of justice'.³ An interesting confession: revealing, as it does, both the barbarity of the time and the way in which Christianity mitigated the rigours of the law and, in its theology, was in turn influenced by them. In these and other cases Augustine employed his privilege of intercession, against extreme penalties, both with his friend Marcellinus and with the Proconsul Apringius⁴ his brother.

It was about this time that he was engaged upon a long and interesting letter to the High Commissioner⁵ in answer to some difficulties felt by a thoughtful inquirer named Volusian, a Roman noble who was uncle to Melania the younger, and was ultimately persuaded by her to become a Christian. One of his difficulties was the oft-debated question whether the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount did not make civil government impracticable. 'These precepts', says Augustine,—as to 'turning the other cheek' and 'not resisting him that is evil',—'relate rather to the inward disposition of the heart than to the outward conduct.' Moreover, our Lord, before Caiaphas, did *not* act upon this precept; but, in a Court of Justice, demanded justice.⁶ 'Further,' says Augustine, 'severities to criminals may be the truest mercy, and war itself may be waged in conformity with the benevolent design that, after

¹ Aug. *Epp.* lxxxviii, § 6, cv, § 3 (*Op.* ii. 297 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 305, 397); *Contra Cresconium*, iii, § 53 (*Op.* ix. 462 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 525).

² *Ep.* cxxxiii, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 396; *P. L.* xxxiii. 509).

³ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 396 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 509); Fleury, xxii. xxvi, and Document No. 177.

⁴ *Ep.* cxxxiv (*Op.* ii. 397-9; *P. L.* xxxiii. 510-12); Fleury, xxii. xlvii The Proconsul of Africa ruled only over 'Zeugitana', the other five provinces being under the Vicar of Africa; but both were of small authority, at the opening of the fifth century, compared to the military ruler of the Diocese, viz. the Count of Africa, Hodgkin, i. ii. 242 sq.

⁵ For the letter of Marcellinus and Augustine's answer, see *Epp.* cxxxvi, cxxxviii (*Op.* ii. 400 sq., 410-19; *P. L.* xxxiii. 514 sq., 525-35).

⁶ *Ep.* cxxxviii, § 13 (*Op.* ii. 415 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 530), and Document No. 178.

the resisting nations have been conquered, provision may be more easily made for enjoying in peace the mutual bond of piety and justice.'¹ The Sermon on the Mount, in short, represents only part of our Lord's teaching. In our day, as in Augustine's, men get into difficulties by not looking for its counterpart, in the rest.²

But to return to the edicts. The work of union went on apace ; and the magistrates, under the direction first of Marcellinus and then of his successor Dulcitius, took care that they should be put into execution.

(2) Meanwhile, every publicity was given to the Minutes of the Conference. They were posted up at Carthage ; and there, as at Tagaste, Constantine, Hippo, and other places, they were read in church during Lent.³ But they were too lengthy⁴ to take much effect, so they were put out, in summary form, by Augustine in his *Breviculus Collationis*,⁵ 412, with a view to getting the proceedings of the Conference fully known. Such was the object also of the letter of the Council of Numidia held at Cirta, 14 June 412, which they addressed to the Donatist laity. It ranks as Augustine's one hundred and forty-first epistle, and was not without effect.⁶ For, in the next, he congratulates the people of Cirta on their return to the Church ;⁷ while he made further appeal to the Donatist laity, in his *Ad Donatistas post Collationem*,⁸ 412, not to allow themselves to be misled by anything that their bishops might report to the discredit of the Conference, as that the Catholics had bought a verdict.⁹

(3) Two curious episodes bring out, one the sullen, and the other the fiery, type of fanatic who had to be reconciled.

In 418 Augustine had occasion¹⁰ to pay a visit to Caesarea in Mauretania. Here he met the Donatist bishop of the place,

¹ *Ep.* cxxxviii, § 14 (*Op.* ii. 415 G ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 531), and Document No. 178.

² See C. Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 86 sq.

³ *De gestis cum Emerito*, § 4 (*Op.* ix. 627 sq. ; *P. L.* xliii. 700).

⁴ They consisted originally of 587 articles, the titles of which have come down to us, but of these only 281 are extant, *Gest. Coll.* (Opt. 245 ; *P. L.* xi. 1258) ; Fleury, xxii. xl. It is quite enough to read 39 articles in church !

⁵ *Op.* ix. 545-80 (*P. L.* xliii. 613-50).

⁶ *Ep.* cxli (*Op.* ii. 456-61 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 577-83) ; Fleury, xxii. xlix.

⁷ *Ep.* cxlii (*Op.* ii. 461-3 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 583-5).

⁸ *Op.* ix. 581-616 (*P. L.* xliii. 651-90).

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 57 (*Op.* ix. 615 B ; *P. L.* xliii. 687).

¹⁰ On business committed to him by Pope Zosimus, Possidius, *Vita*, § 14 (*Op.* x, app. 266 c ; *P. L.* xxxii. 45) ; Epp. cxc, § 1, cxcii, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 700 B, 711 B ; *P. L.* cxxxii. 857, 869) ; Fleury, xxiii. lv.

Emeritus, who had been one of their spokesmen at the Conference. Most of his flock had rallied to the Church, but a few still clung to him. Meeting him in the street, Augustine proposed that they should continue their conversation in the church. So they withdrew thither¹; and, as the discussion between two such protagonists drew crowds to listen, Augustine took occasion to address them in his *Sermo "ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem,"*² in the course of which he repeated the offer, made at the Conference, to receive Emeritus and others, as bishops, if they would be reconciled.³ Two days later, 20 September, 418, a conference was held, of which the minutes have come down to us in the *De gestis cum Emerito.*⁴ But Emeritus would not be drawn. For all his facility of speech at Carthage, he confined himself now to a protest against the use which the Catholics were making of that Conference. 'The minutes show', he said, 'whether I gained or lost: whether I was overcome by truth or by force.'⁵ Then he relapsed into silence. He lost a few more adherents. But he was not himself disturbed.

Next year, 419, Dulcitius, as High Commissioner, visited Tamugada (Timgad) to carry out the policy of union; and wrote, for the purpose, to Gaudentius the Donatist bishop, who had also been one of the champions of his party at Carthage. Timgad was in the centre of the Circumcellions' country, in the Aures mountains; and its bishop, though a cultivated and eloquent man, was touched with their fiery temper. He had threatened, if the edicts were imposed there, to burn himself and his flock, with the church over their heads. Dulcitius wrote to dissuade him; but he replied in two letters, reaffirming his resolve: and these Dulcitius forwarded to Augustine for an answer.⁶ Hence, after a time (for Augustine wrote, at first, that he was too busy⁷), the *Contra Gaudentium*,⁸ 420. Gaudentius had appealed, by way of precedent, to the case of the Jew, Razis, who 'fell upon his sword' to avoid slavery⁹ (2 *Macc.* xv. 7-46). In Book I, Augustine accepts 2 *Maccabees* as Scripture¹⁰;

¹ *De gestis cum Emerito*, § 1 (*Op.* ix. 625 c; *P. L.* xliii. 697).

² *Op.* ix. 617-24 (*P. L.* xliii. 689-98).

³ *Sermo*, &c., § 1 (*Op.* ix. 618 B; *P. L.* xliii. 691).

⁴ *Op.* ix. 625-34 (*P. L.* xliii. 697-706); Fleury, xxiii. lv.

⁵ *De gestis*, § 3 (*Op.* ix. 627 D; *P. L.* xliii. 700).

⁶ *Retract.* ii, § 59 (*Op.* i. 61 sq.; *P. L.* xxxii. 654); Fleury, xxiv. c. xxii.

⁷ *Ep.* cciv, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 765 F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 940).

⁸ *Op.* ix. 635-76 (*Op.* xliii. 707-52).

⁹ *Ep.* cciv, §§ 6, 7 (*Op.* ii. 766; *P. L.* xxxiii. 941).

¹⁰ *Contra Gaud.* i, § 38 (*Op.* ix. 655 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 729).

and, in commenting on the case, observes that it is irrelevant.¹ The object of the penal laws against the Donatists is not their death but their reformation; or, at the worst, their banishment.² Gaudentius sent a rejoinder³; and in Book II Augustine replies with a final answer. Both parties address themselves, with wearisome calm, to the well-worn arguments—Gaudentius torch-in-hand the while!

We do not know whether Emeritus remained a Donatist to the end, or whether Gaudentius carried out his threat. Dulcitius proposed to Augustine eight questions on several passages of Scripture, and Augustine replied, 422–5, by extracts from his other works, in the *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus*,⁴ and specially from a book that he had written about 421, for the High Commissioner's brother, entitled *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*.⁵ It was 'an excellent abridgement of divinity'. Eighteen years later, by the capture of Carthage,⁶ October 439, the Vandals became masters of Africa⁷; and a Donatist was at liberty to please himself. The Laws of the Empire had ceased to run in Africa. Donatism also ceased to be of importance; but there were Donatists in Numidia to the days of St. Gregory the Great,⁸ and till the Arab invasion.

¹ *Contra Gaud.* i, § 36 (*Op.* ix. 654 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 728).

² *Ibid.*, § 41 (*Op.* ix. 657 sq.; *P. L.* xliii. 731).

³ *Ibid.* ii, § 1 (*Op.* ix. 665 f; *P. L.* xliii. 741).

⁴ *Op.* vi. 121–40 (*P. L.* xl. 147–70).

⁵ *Op.* vi. 195–242 (*P. L.* xl. 231–90).

⁶ Fleury, xxiv. xxiii.

⁷ *Ibid.* xxvi. xlii; Gibbon, c. xxxiii (iii. 403 sq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 932. For the wickedness of Carthage, which was the real reason of her downfall, as indeed of that of the Empire too, see Aug. *Conf.* iii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 87 D; *P. L.* xxxii. 683); *Ep.* cxxxviii, § 14 (*Op.* ii. 416; *P. L.* xxxiii. 531), and Document No. 178; and Salvian, *De gub. Dei*, vii, §§ 16, 17 (*Op.* 160–4; *P. L.* liii. 142–5).

⁸ See the extracts from his letters in *Opt. Op.* 334–6 (*P. L.* xi. 1435–8).

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST DECADE (ii) : AUGUSTINE, JEROME, ALARIC

III

AUGUSTINE and Jerome, while the former was still in the thick of the conflict with Donatism, were brought into controversy : first, Augustine with the Manichaeans ; then Jerome and Augustine with each other ; finally, Jerome with Vigilantius. Shortly afterwards, Alaric captured Rome.

§ 1. Augustine, in 404, had to deal with Felix the Manichaean.¹ Felix was one of their elect, and of their doctors. He came to Hippo to spread the tenets of his sect² ; and, after a first conference in which he undertook to maintain the truth of the writings of Manes, a second was agreed upon, to be held in the church of Hippo. It took place 7 and 12 December 404 ; and the minutes, as taken down by notaries public, have come down to us as *De actis cum Felice Manichaeo*.³ Felix had given a guarantee to the magistrates that he was ready to be burnt, with his books, if anything in them were found false⁴ ; for then, as during the Reformation, a champion staked his life before a Disputation by way of attesting his sincerity.⁵ Thus challenged, Augustine took up the letter of Manes which his followers called the *Epistle of the Foundation*,⁶ and which he had dealt with, some eight years previously, in his *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant Fundamenti*.⁷ ‘ Prove to us ’, he asked, ‘ how Manes is an Apostle ; for we do not find him in the Gospel.’⁸ ‘ Nay : but you prove to me how Christ fulfilled his promise to send the Holy Ghost.’⁹ Augustine read the story of the descent of the Holy Ghost at

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 412-14 ; Fleury, xxi. lv-lvii.

² *Retract.* ii, § 8 (*Op.* i. 45 ; *P. L.* xxxii. 633).

³ *Op.* viii. 471-500 (*P. L.* xlii. 519-52) ; Possidius, *Vita*, § 16 (*Op.* x, app. 267 sq. ; *P. L.* xxxii. 46 sq.).

⁴ *De act. c. Fel.* i, § 12 (*Op.* viii. 479 D ; *P. L.* xlii. 527).

⁵ e. g. Farel and the Anabaptists in dispute at Geneva, 14 March 1537, B. J. Kidd, *Documents*, No. 287.

⁶ *De act. c. Fel.* i, § 1 (*Op.* viii. 471 B ; *P. L.* xlii. 519).

⁷ *Op.* viii. 151-82 (*P. L.* xlii. 173-206).

⁸ *De act. c. Fel.* i, § 1 (*Op.* viii. 471 D ; *P. L.* xlii. 519).

⁹ *Ibid.* i, § 2.

Pentecost, from the *Acts of the Apostles*.¹ Whereupon Felix demanded: 'Give me then one of the Apostles who may either teach me what Manes taught, or else demolish his doctrine.'² 'Manes', said Augustine, 'had not made his appearance in the days of the Apostles; but I will tell you of one of them who condemned his teaching by anticipation;' and he read from 1 *Tim.* iv. 1 how 'in the latter times some should depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving'. 'Did Felix agree that all meats were pure, and marriage lawful?'³ Felix shied at the query, and proceeded: 'You say that the Holy Ghost came in Paul. But Paul wrote that our knowledge is imperfect; yet that, when perfection shall come, our knowledge will be superseded. Well: Manes is come now. He has taught us the beginning, the middle and the end; he has instructed us in the creation of the world, the causes of day and night, the courses of sun and moon; and, as we have not found these things in Paul or the other Apostles, we believe him to be the Paraclete.'⁴ We need not plunge into the abysses of 'the Persian tale',⁵ nor pursue further the meanderings of the Disputation. The chief attraction of Manichaeism, as Felix here admits was its promise to gratify curiosity about the material universe. We should look upon any such promise, on the part of a religious teacher, as a sure sign of charlatanism; but, in a world which knew nothing of scientific research, the promise was alluring. This may well account for the fact that Manichaeism was a long-lived error; and reappeared again and again till it was put down in the crusade against the Albigenses,⁶ 1208-29. Quite as attractive was the attempt of Manichaeism 'to turn the Gospel into a philosophy of nature; for men are always ready to substitute the speculative for the practical'⁷ when they want a way of escape from the difficulties of things as they are. So the Manichaean professed to give demonstration,⁸ and by that means to dispense with faith; in particular, to give knowledge of the physical universe, which Christianity does not

¹ *De act. c. Fel.* i, § 4. ² *Ibid.* i, § 6. ³ *Ibid.*, § 7. ⁴ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁵ *De utilitate credendi*, § 36 (*Op.* viii. 70 D; *P. L.* xlii. 92).

⁶ Gibbon, c. liv (vi. 124); R. C. Trench, *Med. Ch. Hist.* c. xv; C. Hardwick, *Middle Ages*, 188 sq., 286 sq.

⁷ R. C. Trench, *Hulsean Lectures for 1845* ⁵, 21.

⁸ *Aug. Conf.* iii, § 12, v, § 12 (*Op.* i. 92 D, 112 D; *P. L.* xxxii. 688, 711).

pretend to bestow. The followers of Manes, therefore, would fill up the blanks of this defective system, while exploiting its terms, such as 'redemption', 'restoration', and the like, for his own purposes; and looking down upon the ordinary Christian as unscientific and credulous.¹ Of such contempt, Augustine's *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*,² c. 400, furnishes us with the best examples. A good deal of it is occupied with the refutation of what then passed for 'science' but to us seems the wildest nonsense: yet we find ourselves met there by many of the modern objections to Christianity, e.g. disparagement of the Gospel-narratives; criticism of the two genealogies, as at variance with each other³; the substitution of mere belief for duty,⁴ and a good deal of subjective criticism of the New Testament.⁵ It was, however, in offering to satisfy the demand that a man ought to be able to find in the Bible an 'Inquire-within-upon-everything', that the strength of Manichaeism lay. This was the claim for superiority which—to return to the Disputation—Felix put in for Manes. 'He is the Paraclete, and will teach us everything.' 'But we do not read in the Gospel', replied Augustine, 'that Christ hath said, "I send you the Paraclete to instruct you concerning sun and moon"'. His design was to make Christians, not mathematicians; but if Manes has told you all the secrets of this world we live in, then tell me how many stars there are. You are bound to answer me, since you assert that the Holy Ghost has taught you things of this kind.'⁶ Felix found himself in a difficulty, and asked for a delay.⁷ A second Disputation was held on 12 December, when Felix yielded to Augustine's arguments and had the candour to become a Catholic.⁸ Augustine, in previous works, had shown that the supreme need is not scientific attainments, but to know God; and that, while demonstration has its place, yet faith is a reasonable principle.⁹ In the *De natura boni contra Manichaeos*,¹⁰ c. 404, he proceeded to show

¹ *Aug. Conf.* vi, § 7 (*Op.* i. 122 E; *P. L.* xxxii. 722).

² *Op.* viii. 183–470 (*P. L.* xlii. 207–518).

³ *Contra Faustum*, iii, § 1 (*Op.* viii. 189 C; *P. L.* xlii. 213).

⁴ *Ibid.* v, § 3 (*Op.* viii. 196; *P. L.* xlii. 221).

⁵ *Ibid.* xxxii, § 7 (*Op.* viii. 454 D; *P. L.* xlii. 501). Note § 8 where Augustine appeals, in reply, to the doctrine of a progressive revelation.

⁶ *De act. c. Fel.* i, § 10 (*Op.* viii. 477 B–E; *P. L.* xlii. 525).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 20 (*Op.* viii. 485 C; *P. L.* xlii. 534).

⁸ *Ibid.* ii, § 22 (*Op.* viii. 500 E; *P. L.* xlii. 551 sq.).

⁹ e. g. in *De util. cred.* of 391 and *De fide rerum quae non videntur* of 399, *ut sup.*

¹⁰ *Op.* viii. 501–18 (*P. L.* xlii. 551–72).

that God is the sovereign-good, and that evil is not in natures proceeding from Him, but in a perverted will; and he followed it up by the *Contra Secundinum Manichaeum*,¹ c. 405, in which he answers the charge of having abandoned Manichaeism out of fear, and for the sake of his prospects.

About the same time, in a pamphlet now lost, he replied to a retired Colonel, named Hilary, who had lost his temper with the clergy over a new piece of ritual—not ceremonial²—lately introduced at Carthage, where they had taken to singing Psalms at the Offertory and during the Communion.³ The chants in question consisted of the Responsory Psalm called the *Offertorium* in the one place and the *Communio* in the other. These two, with the *Introit*, were ‘covering’ chants, to be sung while long ceremonies were going on. They must be distinguished from *Gradual*, *Alleluia*, and *Tract* which were sung for their own sake while nothing else was going on, and represent the ancient psalmody alternating with the lessons of the Synagogue service.⁴ All this, however, was new to the gallant Colonel on half-pay; and he is the first on record of a goodly company who have similarly employed their leisure in our own day.

§ 2. In this year, 405, there came to an end a correspondence⁵ which had gone on at intervals for some ten or twelve years and had brought Jerome and Augustine into controversy, 394–405, over matters of more interest to us than Manichaeism. Two questions of moment were involved. First, Could the Septuagint claim an absolute authority? or, to put it the other way round, Was Jerome right in undertaking a new revision from the Hebrew such as we learn from the *Prologus Galeatus* of 391 he had then in hand, at the risk of shocking prepossessions in favour of familiar versions? Secondly, Was St. Peter’s weakness and St. Paul’s rebuke at Antioch simulated or real? Each of the two great

¹ *Op.* viii. 523–48 (*P. L.* xlii. 577–602).

² A ‘rite’ is the Order or Form of Service; ‘ceremonies’ are the acts, gestures, or ornaments used for its expression: see Archbishop Benson, *Read and others v. the Bishop of Lincoln*, 70 sq.

³ *Retract.* ii, § 11 (*Op.* i. 45 F; *P. L.* xxxii. 634).

⁴ Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*⁵, 169, 173 sq., 187.

⁵ Jerome, *Epp.* cii, ciii, cv, cxii, cxv (*Op.* ii. 632–761; *P. L.* xxiii. 830–935); and Aug. *Epp.* xxviii, xl, lxvii, lxxi, lxxiii, lxxxii (*Op.* ii. 45–203; *P. L.* xxxiii. 111–291); Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 269–82, and xiii. 300, 385 sq.; Fleury, xxi. xxviii, xxix; J. B. Lightfoot, *On a fresh revision of the English N. T.*², § 1; and, for the chronology of these letters, H. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, i. 82–5.

Doctors at length gave up an impossible position. Augustine came to acknowledge the value of an independent translation from the Hebrew original. Jerome learned the more important lesson that Scripture could authorize no pious frauds. This Augustine felt keenly. His experience of Manichaean impostures prepared him to insist with special energy on the duty of truthfulness in the cause of Truth.

Jerome had begun to hear of Augustine soon after the latter's conversion in 386; for Augustine's friend Alypius, shortly before he became bishop of Tagaste, 394-†429, paid him a visit at Bethlehem, 393. On his return, Alypius probably told Augustine of the tasks upon which Jerome was engaged, as we know he told him of Jerome's personal appearance¹—his translations from the Hebrew, as of the *Book of Job*, c. 393, and his commentaries as on *Galatians*, 386-7. Augustine thereupon wrote him his twenty-eighth epistle, 394, which initiated the controversy. He begs that, in translating the Old Testament, Jerome would note places where he diverges from the Septuagint, 'whose authority is worthy of the highest esteem'²; and then he goes on to urge that to take the dispute between St. Peter and St. Paul as a piece of acting³ got up in order to impress upon Christians the blameworthiness of a Christian keeping the ceremonial law, as Jerome had taken the scene in his commentary on *Galatians*,⁴ was to admit a dangerous principle. 'If you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority [as Holy Scripture] one false statement as made in the way of duty, there will not be left a single sentence of those books which, on appearing to any one difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away as a statement in which, intentionally and under a sense of duty, the author declared what was not true.'⁵ The letter remained unanswered for nine years. It was entrusted to Profuturus,⁶ a friend who was making a journey to Palestine. But just as he was starting he was made bishop of Cirta, and died shortly afterwards,⁷ without having either sent the letter on to Jerome or returned it to Augustine. A year or so later, Augustine would seem to have sent Jerome a salutation at the end of

¹ Aug. Ep. xxviii, § 1.

² Ibid., § 4.

³ Ibid., § 3.

⁴ 'Simulata contentio,' *Comm. in Gal.* [ii. 11 sqq.] i, § 2 (*Op.* vii. 408; *P. L.* xxvi. 340 c).

⁵ Aug. Ep. xxviii, § 3.

⁶ Ibid., § 1.

⁷ Aug. Ep. lxxi, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 160 B, c; *P. L.* xxxiii. 241); cf. xl, § 8, and Jerome, Ep. cv, § 1.

a letter¹ to which Jerome replied by a subdeacon named Asterius in a letter of 397 now lost.² To Augustine's surprise, he made no allusion to the letter sent by Profuturus; and, surmising that it had never reached him, Augustine, 397, wrote again, in his fortieth epistle. Here he goes over the ground again,³ and asks Jerome for a 'palinode' in reparation for the wrong he had done to 'Christian truth'.⁴ But this second letter of Augustine's miscarried. For Paul, to whom he had entrusted it,⁵ proved untrustworthy; and let it be circulated in Rome and in Italy without taking care that it should be forwarded to Jerome. It was seen by the deacon Sisinnius in an island of the Adriatic; who, five years afterwards, told Jerome, 402, of its contents, at Bethlehem.⁶ Jerome suspected something wrong; but, unlike himself, kept quiet. Then Augustine heard, through some pilgrims returning from Palestine, what the state of affairs there was. He at once wrote a third, and short, letter—his sixty-seventh, of 402—to excuse himself; saying that the rumour of his having published a book against Jerome and sent it to Rome was quite untrue: he had merely sent a private and friendly letter to express a difference of opinion on a point of Scriptural interpretation.⁷ To this Jerome replied, in his hundred and second letter, of 402, that he will not write in reference to the letter which Sisinnius had shown him till he hears that it is really Augustine's.⁸ But 'because you are young', he adds, 'do not challenge a veteran in the field of Scripture: for, like old Entellus, I can still hit hard if I am roused!'⁹ Augustine, in reply, sent a fourth letter—his seventy-first epistle—by Cyprian the deacon, 403. He enclosed copies of his earlier letters by Profuturus, by Paul,¹⁰ and by a third person¹¹; and explained how the first had miscarried. Then he begged Jerome to translate the Scriptures into Latin from the Septuagint and not from the Hebrew,¹² enforcing his request by the story of his colleague, the bishop of Oea, in Tripoli: who, in reading *Jonah* iv. 6, almost broke up the peace of his diocese by substituting the *hedera* of Jerome's new version for the *cucurbita* which had been of old familiar to

¹ Aug. *Ep.* xl, § 1.

² Jerome, *Ep.* ciii, § 12. On the date, Tillemont, xii, n. lxxii; Grütz-macher, i. 83.

³ Aug. *Ep.* xl, §§ 3-6.

⁴ Ibid., § 7.

⁵ Ibid., § 9.

⁶ Jerome, *Ep.* cv, § 1.

⁷ Aug. *Ep.* lxxvii, § 2.

⁸ Jerome, *Ep.* cv, § 10.

⁹ Ibid. cii, § 2.

¹⁰ Aug. *Ep.* lxxi, § 2.

¹¹ Jerome, *Ep.* cv, § 1.

¹² Aug. *Ep.* lxxi, § 4.

the senses and memory of all the worshippers and had been chanted for so many generations in the church.¹ Before receiving this letter and its enclosures, Jerome wrote, in his hundred and fifth letter of 403, to say that he had not yet received Augustine's original letter, nor an authenticated copy of that which was published in Italy and shown him by Sisinnius²; and he adds, not unnaturally but rather testily, by way of conclusion: 'Farewell, my son in years, my father in ecclesiastical dignity; and please take care, after this, that I be the first to receive whatever you may write to me.'³ To this Augustine replied by a fifth communication, reckoned as his seventy-third letter of 404, which he sent by Praesidius, a bishop to whom he also gave copies of the earlier correspondence, both Jerome's and his own. He begged that the matter might be treated as between friends, and not grow into a feud like that between Jerome and Rufinus.⁴ On receipt of this, Jerome was in a position, at last, to answer the letters which Augustine had dispatched by Profuturus, Paul, and Cyprian—the three principal letters⁵ of the series. Cyprian was in a hurry to return; and Jerome had but three days in which to reply before he started back.⁶ But, in his hundred and twelfth letter of the end of 404 (for he mentions that Chrysostom was no longer bishop of Constantinople⁷), he touched on all the points raised; and, on the question of the scene at Antioch, appealed to Origen,⁸ Chrysostom,⁹ and other Eastern expositors to bear him out. 'They do not defend the use of falsehood in the interest of religion, as you charge them with doing, but they teach the honourable exercise of a wise discretion—in answer to Porphyry who says that Peter and Paul quarrelled with each other in childish rivalry.'¹⁰ The tone of this reply was rather tart; and, to excuse it, Jerome wrote again, the short letter sent by Firmus, 405, which ranks as his hundred and fifteenth. 'Let us exercise ourselves in the field of Scripture without wounding each other.' No sooner had Augustine received this appeal than he replied to Jerome's hundred and fifth, -twelfth, and -fifteenth, in a sixth and long letter of 405 (his eighty-second), which was the last that passed between them in this controversy. He goes over the ground once more; but the interest of the letter lies in

¹ Aug. *Ep.*, § 5. ² Jerome, *Ep.* cv, § 1. ³ *Ibid.*, § 5. ⁴ *Ibid.*, § 6.

⁵ i. e. Aug. *Epp.* xxviii, xl, lxxi.

⁶ Jerome, *Ep.* cxii, § 1.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 6; Chrysostom left CP. 20 June 404.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 11.

its *obiter dicta*. It contains Augustine's famous tribute to Holy Scripture: 'I have learnt to yield this respect and honour only to the canonical books of Scripture: of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error. . . . As to all other writings . . . I accept their teaching as true . . . only in so far as they have succeeded in convincing my judgement of its truths, either by means of these canonical writings themselves, or by arguments addressed to my reason.'¹ It also contains his no less celebrated testimony to the superiority of the episcopate. 'I pray you', he says, 'correct boldly whatever you see needful to censure in my writings. For although . . . a bishop's rank is above that of a presbyter, nevertheless in many things Augustine is inferior to Jerome.'² But throughout this correspondence Augustine showed himself the superior in something better than rank. He proved himself the true gentleman, which Jerome never was. On the merits of the question, each had something to learn: Augustine, the reverence due to the original in the interests of truth, and Jerome the supreme claims of truthfulness in the same cause. They parted wiser men; and—wondrous to relate of a quarrel to which Jerome was a party—better friends.

§ 3. Far different was the issue of the strife between Jerome and Vigilantius,³ 404–6.

Vigilantius was of Gallic birth,⁴ c. 370, the son of an innkeeper at Calagurris,⁵ now Cazères, in Aquitania II. The village was in the district of Convenae⁶ (Comminges), and lay on the high road from Aquitaine into Spain: whence the inn between St. Bertrand-de-Comminges and Toulouse, and in the diocese of Toulouse. Vigilantius, whom Jerome calls Dormitantius and a tapster,⁷ was employed in youth at his father's trade. But he was of a studious disposition; and Sulpicius Severus,⁸ 363–†425, who had estates in those parts, took him into his service, possibly as steward of his property. He was ordained in the diocese of Barcelona,⁹ and, through Sulpicius, became acquainted with Paulinus,

¹ Aug. *Ep.* lxxxii, § 3.

² *Ibid.*, § 33.

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 192 sqq., 266 sqq.; Fleury, xxii. v, vi; J. H. Newman, *Ch. F.* c. xv.

⁴ Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, § 36 (*P. L.* lviii. 1078).

⁵ Jerome, *Adv. Vig.*, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 387; *P. L.* xxiii. 340 A).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 389; *P. L.* xxiii. 342 A).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 387; *P. L.* xxiii. 339 A).

⁸ Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 586–611.

⁹ Gennadius, *ut sup.*

bishop of Nola¹ 409–†31 ; a man who, after filling the high office of Consul, 379, devoted himself to the life of an ascetic, 394, and carried reverence for the saints, especially for St. Felix of Nola, further than it had yet gone. After visiting Paulinus, 395, Vigilantius set out for the East, 396, with letters of introduction from Paulinus to Jerome² ; and it is pertinent to notice that, shortly before this, Jerome had written to dissuade Paulinus from making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem on the ground—already taken by Gregory of Nyssa³—and afterwards to be taken by St. Boniface,⁴ in 748—that places of pilgrimage, Jerusalem in particular, were morally bad.⁵ Vigilantius was honourably received by Jerome at Bethlehem, and was there at the time of the earthquake in 396.⁶

But, before long, disagreements arose. Perhaps association with three men of the hagiolatrous type in succession had by this time become somewhat oppressive to Vigilantius ; perhaps the atmosphere was simply stormy, as it periodically became, wherever Jerome was. Anyhow, he begged to take leave ; and without giving any reason. He returned to Gaul ; and, settling in his native country, began to spread reports of Jerome as a partisan of Origen. Jerome sent him a letter of rebuke,⁷ 396. Then there was a lull till some eight years later, when Riparius, a Gallic presbyter, informed Jerome of the new teaching which Vigilantius was spreading abroad against relics⁸ and the keeping of Vigils⁹ ; and that, not without the favour of Exuperius, his bishop.¹⁰ Jerome replied in a letter of 404 which, for all its indignation, is of interest as an absolute disclaimer, on his part, of the worship of any other but God. ‘ We honour the relics of the martyrs, that we may adore Him whose martyrs they are.’¹¹ Similar disclaimers

¹ Paulinus, *Ep.* v, § 11 (*Op.* 25 ; *P. L.* lxi. 172 c) ; for his life, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 1–146.

² Jerome, *Epp.* lviii, § 11, lxi, § 3 (*Op.* i. 327, 350 ; *P. L.* xxii. 586, 605).

³ Greg. Nyss. *Ep.* ii (*Op.* iii ; *P. G.* xlv. 1012 d).

⁴ A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils, &c.*, iii. 381.

⁵ Jerome, *Ep.* lviii, § 4 (*Op.* i. 321 ; *P. L.* xxii. 582), and Document No. 145.

⁶ *Adv. Vig.*, § 11 (*Op.* ii. 397 ; *P. L.* xxi. 340).

⁷ *Ep.* lxi (*Op.* i. 347 sq. ; *P. L.* xxii. 602–6) ; important for Jerome’s admissions and disclaimers of Origenism.

⁸ Jerome, *Ep.* cix, § 1 (*Op.* i. 725 ; *P. L.* xxii. 906).

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* i. 728 ; *P. L.* xxii. 909).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op.* i. 726 ; *P. L.* xxii. 907) ; *Adv. Vig.*, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 388 ; *P. L.* xxiii. 340).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 1, *ut sup.*

are common in the Fathers¹; but the purpose of the letter was to ask Riparius for the pamphlet of Vigilantius.² This Riparius sent him; and, in a single night,³ for the messenger, Sisinnius, was in haste to be gone,⁴ Jerome dictated 'the most extreme and least convincing' of his works, the *Contra Vigilantium*,⁵ 406. According to Jerome, Vigilantius had written 'not hastily, under provocation, such as he may have felt on leaving Bethlehem'; but deliberately, after the lapse of several years. He 'denied that religious reverence is to be paid to the tombs of the martyrs'. 'Vigils', he says, 'are to be condemned; Alleluia must never be sung except at Easter; continence is a heresy; chastity a hot-bed of lust.'⁶ This hardly reads like a dispassionate summary; and we may take it that Vigilantius assailed, somewhat coarsely perhaps, certain growing customs that he felt to be dangerous: the reverence paid to relics by carrying them in costly shrines or silken wrappings; offering them to be kissed,⁷ with prayers to the martyr; vigils at the tombs of the martyrs, with their attendant scandals,⁸ and with tapers,⁹ alleged miracles,¹⁰ and the like; the sending of alms to Jerusalem¹¹ which, as Vigilantius urged, had better be spent on the poor at home than on persons living in the Holy City under vows of poverty¹²; and an exaggerated estimate of virginity.¹³ A temperate warning would have been a well-timed service to religion. For there were dangerous elements at work in these observances. Augustine had not failed to notice the risks belonging to wakes, and to popular devotions to pictures¹⁴; while Jerome himself admits the mischief that went on between lads and lasses at the Easter Vigil.¹⁵ But Vigilantius assailed all with indiscriminating impetuosity. He denounced all reverence for the relics of the martyrs, and so needlessly offended a not unnatural Christian sentiment. For while the memory of persecution

¹ e. g. *Mart. Pol.* xvii, § 3 (= *Eus. H. E.* iv. xv, § 42); *Ath. Orat. c. Ar.* ii, § 23 (*Op.* ii. 388; *P. G.* xxvi. 196 A); *Epiph. Haer.* lxiv (*Op.* i. 532; *P. G.* xlii. 1084); *Aug. De vera religione*, § 108 (*Op.* i. 786 B; *P. L.* xxxii. 169); *Contra Faustum*, xx, § 21 (*Op.* viii. 347 B; *P. L.* xlii. 384); *De Civitate Dei*, viii. xxvii, § 1 (*Op.* vii. 217; *P. L.* xli. 255).

² Jerome, *Ep.* cix, § 4 (*Op.* i. 728; *P. L.* xxii. 909).

³ *Adv. Vig.*, § 3 (*Op.* ii. 389; *P. L.* xxiii. 341 sq.).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 17 (*Op.* ii. 401 sq.; *P. L.* xxiii. 352).

⁵ *Op.* ii. 387-402 (*P. L.* xxiii. 339-52).

⁶ *Adv. Vig.*, § 1.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 10.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 13.

¹² *Ibid.*, § 14.

¹³ *Ibid.*, §§ 15-17.

¹⁴ *Aug. De moribus eccl. Cath.* (*Op.* i. 713; *P. L.* xxxii. 1342).

¹⁵ *Adv. Vig.*, § 9.

was still fresh, the affectionate reverence¹ for those who had played the man was a thing to be at once esteemed and expected. He also gave a shock to Christian instincts such as led Augustine to hold it lawful to commend a soul in prayer to a martyr,² by denying outright that the Church at rest could intercede for the Church militant.³ He did not deny that miracles were wrought at the martyrs' tombs, but complained that they benefit none but unbelievers; and thus he implied that, as miracles were for the unbelieving and the world now believed, the time for them was past.⁴ He desired the abolition of all Vigils, save that of Easter,⁵ as the parents of disorder; condemned the monastic life and the celibacy of the clergy,⁶ though these had their value in an age when, according to Salvian, 400-†80, hardly any one, outside the ranks of the Religious and the clergy, was chaste,⁷ and when Exuperius and other bishops, who sympathized to some extent with Vigilantius, thought it safe to promote none but married men to Holy Orders⁸; and he objected to lighting candles in the day-time at the tombs of the martyrs,⁹ and to the frequent singing of Alleluia.¹⁰

But Jerome was not less indiscriminate in his defence. It is vulgar, abusive, and, at points, inconsistent with itself. For he partly denies the existence of the abuses in question, or allows that they obtained only as popular and unauthorized devotions; and then asks how can Vigilantius presume to question practices approved by Emperors¹¹ and bishops.¹² He defends the veneration of relics, and demands, 'Who ever worshipped martyrs?'¹³ He denied that tapers were lit in the day-time to their honour; but affirmed that, throughout the East, lighted candles were used, by way of showing joy, at the reading of the Gospel.¹⁴ The interest of the discussion lies in the testimony which the disputants bear to the influence on the mentality of Christians and the worship

¹ e. g. *Mart. Pol.* xviii, § 3 (*Eus. H. E.* iv. xv, § 44); Cyprian, *Ep.* lx (*C. S. E. L.* iii. ii. 691-5).

² Aug. *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, § 6 (*Op.* vi. 519 D; *P. L.* xl. 596).

³ *Adv. Vig.*, § 6. ⁴ *Ibid.*, § 10. ⁵ *Ibid.*, § 9. ⁶ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁷ *De gub. Dei*, vii, § 17 (*Op.* 163; *P. L.* liii. 145 A).

⁸ *Adv. Vig.*, §§ 2, 17; there were two rival policies for keeping the clergy free from 'the corruption that is in the world through lust': (1) that no married man should be ordained, (2) that no man should be ordained till he was married. In either case, he was under vows. Rome stood for (1); Spain and Gaul for (2): see Fleury, xxii. v. ⁹ *Ibid.*, § 7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 1. He desired to have Alleluia confined to Easter, in opposition to the custom of Spain and Palestine; but, if *Soz. H. E.* vii. xix, § 4 is correct, in accordance with the use of the church of Rome.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 5. ¹² *Ibid.*, §§ 5, 8. ¹³ *Ibid.*, § 5. ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, § 7.

of the Church exerted from outside—from the Imperial Court¹ as well as from decadent paganism. The carrying of lights, for example, at the Gospel was simply a mode of doing honour to Him, whose voice it is, that was borrowed from the torches carried before a Praetorian Prefect in the Imperial service.² It is only just to Vigilantius to remember that our knowledge of his opinions comes from a violent and unscrupulous adversary. Probably they were a reaction, as violent, from what he had seen in the practice, also extreme, of men like Sulpicius, Paulinus, and Jerome himself. We cannot acquit him either of over-statement; or of actual error in doctrine as in the denial that the Church at rest could intercede for the Church militant. And it is held by some that *Sanctorum communio* got into the creed in order to protect the truth that Vigilantius thus denied. But it is something in his favour that his bishop, Exuperius of Toulouse, with others, both bishops and laity, gave him their countenance³; and certainly the superstitions to which he took exception, though then but nascent and capable, historically, of reasonable and charitable explanation, increased in volume until they were finally extruded, as roughly as he had impugned them, at the Reformation.⁴

IV

The din of these controversies was barely hushed, when a disaster of appalling magnitude overtook the Western Empire by the invasion of Alaric and the capture of Rome.⁵

§ 4. Alaric, 360–†410, first appears as a leader of auxiliaries in

¹ J. W. Legg, *Church Ornaments and their civil antecedents* (1917); F. E. Brightman, 'Byzantine Imperial Coronations', in *J. T. S.* ii. 359–92 (April 1901).

² Cf. the *Notitia Dignitatum* of c. 402 (ed. O. Seeck), which has, for the insignia of the Praetorian Prefects of Illyricum and Italy, a book of mandates reposing on a richly covered table and flanked by four lighted tapers. The MS. of the early fifth century was copied in January 1436 for Pietro Donato, bishop of Padua, and this facsimile is MS. Canon. Misc. 378, now in the Bodleian Library. The pictures of the insignia of the two Prefects occur on fol. 90 and fol. 131 verso. For torches, similarly carried before the Pope at the Introit, c. A. D. 800, see C. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus*, I, § 8, p. 128. The *Notitia* is tr. in *Translations and Reprints from European History*, vol. vi, No. 4.

³ *Adv. Vig.*, §§ 2, 3.

⁴ e. g. Knox's account of the destruction done at Perth by 'the raschall multitude' on 11 May 1559 in *Doc. Cont. Ref.*, No. 345; or the rejection of prayers for the dead by Art. xxiii of October 1552, assigned by the Royal Chaplains—a condemnation subsequently dropped by the Forty-two Articles: see C. Hardwick, *Articles*, 102, n. 2.

⁵ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 522 sqq.; Fleury, xxii. xix–xxi; Gibbon, xxx, xxxi (iii. 240 sqq.); Hodgkin, I. ii. 702–810.

the armies of Theodosius, with whom he learned his way into Italy, across the Julian Alps, at the battle of the Frigidus, September 394. He was not without culture; and he was a Christian, though an Arian. Raised to be King of the Visigoths,¹ on the death of Theodosius, 395, he led the revolt of his nation against Arcadius, ravaged the Balkan provinces, and invaded Greece. Athens was left untouched; but Corinth, Argos, and Sparta, all fell before him. Stilicho brought him to a standstill in Thessaly,² in the spring of 395; but he escaped the toils. For, in his jealousy of Stilicho, Rufinus had persuaded Arcadius to order the withdrawal of the Western legions; and the Emperor was thus led to be much more afraid of a possible rebel in Stilicho than of the barbarian Alaric. It was an infatuated condition of mind; and when, under the title of 'Master-General of Illyricum',³ Alaric became both an official and an ally of the Empire, 396, with the seat of his authority near Laibach,⁴ he threatened the frontiers both of Arcadius and of Honorius, and could take his choice which realm he would invade.⁵ Perhaps he came to the conclusion that the lines of Constantinople were too strong, or perhaps the oracle kept ringing in his ears, *Penetrabis ad Urbem*. At any rate, Ravenna lay but six days' journey over the passes that he had traversed in the train of Theodosius.

§ 5. He decided upon the invasion of Italy, 400-5. In co-operation with Radagaisus, who was campaigning in Rhaetia (Tyrol and the Grisons) and trying to descend into Italy by the Brenner or the Splügen, Alaric entered Italy by the Pass of the Pear Tree,⁶ down the valley of the Vipacco. Leaving Aquileia and Ravenna untaken, he marched towards Milan. Meanwhile, the Rhine and Britain were denuded of troops for the defence of Italy: the Twentieth Legion, for example, being withdrawn, at this crisis, from Chester, where it had been stationed for three centuries; and Stilicho drove back Radagaisus after a campaign in Rhaetia, 401-2. Then he returned to encounter Alaric. They met some twenty miles south-east of Turin⁷; and on Easter Day, 402, at the battle of Pollentia (Pollenzo), Alaric received a check which compelled him to withdraw for a time. Though no more than a battle drawn in favour of the Roman arms, it was made the occasion of a triumph for Honorius, 404. He crept out from behind the marshes of Ravenna.

¹ Hodgkin, I. ii. 653.² Ibid. 657.³ Ibid. 661, n. 1.⁴ Ibid., 766.⁵ Ibid. 663.⁶ Ibid. 709 sq.⁷ Ibid. 717.

whither he had retired, December 402, to celebrate it in Rome. It might, indeed, have had but melancholy memories as the last Imperial Triumph ever celebrated there ; but it is famous beyond all others as the Triumph which ended in the self-sacrifice of the monk Telemachus¹ and the final² abolition of the gladiatorial games. Having put them down for ever, Honorius retired once more to Ravenna. But only just in time. For a second host of barbarians under Radagaisus, a heathen and an Ostrogoth, descended upon Italy, 405. He was hemmed in before Florence and put to death by Stilicho,³ 406. For a second time Stilicho had deserved the title ' Deliverer of his Country '. But this could not save him from palace intrigues. Olympius, a friend of Augustine's in whom he put too much trust, undermined him in the favour of Honorius, his son-in-law ; and he was put to death before the doors of a church, in which he had taken sanctuary at Ravenna,⁴ 23 August 408. It was an infatuation on the part of Honorius worse than that of his brother Arcadius, when thirteen years before he had dismissed Stilicho and the Western legions ; for no one was now left to keep Alaric out of Italy. Incensed at their patron's murder, the Gothic auxiliaries betook themselves to Alaric, and prayed him to avenge the ill-treatment they had received from the Roman legionaries, from whom Stilicho ever protected them.⁵ Fruitless negotiations⁶ ensued between Alaric and Honorius : and, at last, Alaric decided to play the great game.

§ 6. In the autumn of 408 he once more invaded Italy, with a view to the capture of Rome. It was thrice besieged, 408-10. The first siege took place in the autumn of 408, and was raised by ransom, in spite of the efforts, if we may believe the story, of some Tuscan diviners to keep Alaric at bay by enchantments. They had been sent for by Pompeianus, the Prefect of the City ; and while Pope Innocent, so it was said, was ready to put the safety of Rome before his religion at such a crisis and consent to their offering of sacrifices in public, no one dared take part in their rites : and nothing came of them.⁷ Alaric then raised the siege at

¹ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxvi ; Gibbon, c. xxx, n. 60 (iii. 258).

² Constantine had forbidden them, 1 October 325, by *Cruenta spectacula*, *Cod. Theod.* xv. xii. 1.

³ Hodgkin, I. ii. 731-3. The remainder of the army of Radagaisus, with Vandals, Sueves, and Alans, crossed the Rhine 31 December 406, and devastated Gaul, *ibid.* 739.

⁴ *Ibid.* 756.

⁵ *Ibid.* 760 sq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 766.

⁷ Zosimus, *Hist.* v, §§ 40, 41 ; Soz. *H. E.* ix. vi, §§ 3 sqq.

a heavy price : while Innocent left for Ravenna to make terms for him with Honorius, and Alaric followed him as far as Rimini. But the Emperor's envoy, Jovius, a pagan and Prefect of Italy, proved an unskilful negotiator ; with the result that Alaric returned and laid siege to Rome for the second time, 409. He seized the port, and set up Attalus, the Prefect of the City, as a puppet Emperor. Attalus proceeded to threaten Honorius at Ravenna, and to send Constans to wrest Africa from his allegiance. But his expedition towards Ravenna proved abortive ; and Constans, unsupported, was easily defeated by Count Heraclian, who held Africa for Honorius ; and, by closing the ports and stopping the corn-supply, brought Rome to its knees through famine. Alaric thereupon degraded the incompetent Attalus in the plains of Rimini, and advanced to within three miles of Ravenna to bring Honorius to terms. But the Western Emperor, in the interval, had received reinforcements ¹ from his nephew, Theodosius II. Alaric turned and, for the third time, appeared before the walls of Rome. The Senate prepared to make a desperate resistance ; but they had not reckoned with their dependents. At midnight, so it was said,² some slaves threw open the Salarian gate to the north-east of Rome ; or, according to Orosius, Alaric carried the defences by assault.³ At any rate, on 24 August 410, the Goths entered and sacked the City. The horrors that ensued were, perhaps, less than might have been expected ; for the Goths were Christian, and Alaric had given orders that the churches should be respected, specially the two great basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul.⁴ A band of Gothic soldiers broke into the palace of the aged Marcella on the Aventine, demanded her buried treasure, and beat her because they could not understand her plea of voluntary poverty. At length they relented, accepted her story, and escorted her with her adopted daughter, Principia, safe to the sanctuary of St. Paul's. But she died of shock a few days afterwards.⁵ A Gothic captain burst into a house where they kept the possessions of the church of St. Peter. There was a Religious in charge ; and the soldier asked her, courteously enough, for he was a Christian, whether she had gold

¹ 40,000 men, Zosimus, *Hist.* vi, § 8 ; Hodgkin, i. ii. 788.

² Hodgkin doubts the story of this treachery, 739 sq.

³ Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 39 (*Op.* 573 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 1163 A).

⁴ *Ibid.* and Soz. *H. E.* ix. ix, § 4.

⁵ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxvii, § 13 (*Op.* i. 260 ; *P. L.* xxii. 1094 sq.), and Document No. 149.

and silver in her possession. 'Plenty of it,' she replied, and showed him the Sacred Vessels. 'They are the Apostle Peter's,' she said, 'take them, if you are not afraid.' Fearful of the guilt of sacrilege, the officer sent for instructions to Alaric; and, at his orders, the Consecrated Vessels were carried in procession by his soldiery to a place of safety at St. Peter's.¹ Thither, too, was conducted a beautiful Roman matron, by a Gothic trooper. He had offered her outrage; but she bared her neck to his sword and bade him strike instead. He raised his arm to strike, but relented; then he led her to the church, and, handing six gold pieces to the officers stationed there, implored them to have her sent in safety to her husband.²

§ 7. Far more tragic than the scenes which accompanied the sack of the City was the effect of its capture on the Roman world. Jerome was busy with his commentary on *Ezekiel* when the tidings reached him. 'The whole world', he exclaimed, 'has perished in one City³'; and, in the letter in which he describes the death of Marcella, he recalls how 'a dreadful rumour came from the West. Rome had been besieged and its citizens had been forced to buy their lives with gold. Then, thus despoiled, they had been besieged again, so as to lose not their substance only but their lives. My voice sticks in my throat; and, as I dictate, sobs choke my utterance. The City which had captured the whole world is itself taken captive.'⁴ Not less was the shock which the news gave to St. Augustine. In his sermon, *De Urbis excidio*,⁵ he compares its overthrow to the destruction of Sodom. But, whereas God showed His wrath in the complete destruction of Sodom, towards Rome He had but manifested His displeasure—or rather, His mercy. The multitudes who were suffered to escape before Rome was burnt and, afterwards, were to be found either in exile or among the Faithful Departed, are proof that the City has been chastised, but not doomed.⁶ But beyond the consternation thus reflected in letters and sermons of the time, we have to note permanent effects of the capture of Rome.

(1) First, the immense political importance of the event, in the

¹ Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 39 (*Op.* 574; *P. L.* xxxi. 1163 sq.).

² Soz. *H. E.* ix. x.

³ *Comm. in Ezech.* Praef. (*Op.* v. 3 sq.; *P. L.* xxv. 16 A).

⁴ Jerome, *Ep.* ccxxvii, § 12 (*Op.* i. 959; *P. L.* xxii. 1094), and Document No. 149.

⁵ *Op.* vi. 622-8 (*P. L.* xl. 715-24).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 8 (*Op.* vi. 628 B; *P. L.* xl. 723).

shock that it gave to all that seemed most stable. Twice again was Rome taken, in the fifth century ; and also, in the sixth. But none of these three captures could have the significance of the first. No one now remembers Gaiseric,¹ 455, Ricimer,² 472, and Totila,³ 546 ; but every one has heard the name of Alaric. Even the desert felt the blow ; for barbarians invaded Egypt and turned the monks of Scetis out of their solitudes. ' The world has lost Rome,' said Arsenius, ' and the monks have lost Scetis.'⁴ Like the taking of Jerusalem by Titus, the capture of Rome by the Goths was the end of an age. Jerusalem was to last till ' it was trodden down of the Gentiles '. Now ' the times of its Gentile ' captors ' were fulfilled ' ⁵ ; and a new epoch in the world's history was begun.

(2) Secondly, there was the hopeless and wretched exile of Italians, pagan and Christian. Some fled as far as to Palestine, where Jerome received them at Bethlehem ; and gave such hospitality as he could to fugitives of both sexes and of noble rank, reduced at one stroke from great possessions to beggary.⁶ Melania the elder, 350-†410, and her grandson Publicola, were among them ; and Melania died there.⁷ Others made their way southward, ahead of Alaric. Thus Rufinus passed over to Sicily, and stood on the further shore of the straits of Messina to watch the flames of Reggio kindled by the Goths ; who, having left Rome after three days ⁸ spent in pillaging the City, overran south Italy ⁹ as far as Calabria, and buried their leader Alaric in the bed of the river Busento.¹⁰ Many fugitives crossed into Africa : the rich, to the safe refuge of their estates there ; but the multitude to Carthage, where they soon forgot their destitution in clamouring, as St. Augustine tells us, for favourite actors in its theatres.¹¹ Among the most illustrious of the refugees in Africa was the widowed Proba, with Juliana her daughter-in-law and Demetrias her grand-daughter. Less illustrious, but soon to become more famous, was one who bestowed his commendation on the virgin

¹ Gibbon, xxxvi (iv. 5).

² Ibid. (iv. 44).

³ Ib. xliii (iv. 403).

⁴ H. Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, v. ii, § 6 (p. 429 : Lugduni, 1617).

⁵ Luke xxi. 24.

⁶ Jerome, *Comm. in Ezech.* iii, Praef. (*Op.* v. 79-80 ; *P. L.* xxiv. 75).

⁷ Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* cxviii (*P. G.* xxxiv. 1227 c) = cap. liv (T. and S.), § 6.

⁸ Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 39 (*Op.* 575 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 1164 o).

⁹ Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, I. x, § 2 (*Op.* vii. 11 D ; *P. L.* xli. 24).

¹⁰ Hodgkin, I. ii. 806-8.

¹¹ Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, I. xxxiii (*Op.* vii. 29 sq. ; *P. L.* xli. 45).

Demetrias—the monk Pelagius, with his companion Caelestius. Albina¹ also settled at Tagaste,² with her daughter Melania the younger and her son-in-law Pinian. The wealthy young couple came to visit Augustine at Hippo; and the people wanted to have Pinian ordained priest in their church, though against his will. Thus they would secure to themselves the riches and the prestige of a great noble in exile; for Melania had indeed sold her estates in Spain and Gaul and distributed the proceeds to the poor, but she retained those in Sicily, Campania, and Africa, and from these she maintained churches and religious houses.³ Pinian therefore would be a great catch for Hippo; and an interesting correspondence⁴ of Augustine's is bound up with the incident, in which he discusses the obligatory character of an oath if taken under compulsion.⁵

(3) Thirdly, by the capture of Rome, the way was left open for her to assume 'her second', i.e. as Milman says, 'her Christian Empire'.⁶ When Innocent came back from Ravenna he found the great families gone and no one to rival him in rank or authority. The triumph of Christianity and the greatness of the Papacy were thus both direct and immediate consequences of the fall of Rome.

(4) Last, and perhaps most lasting in influence, of the consequences of the work of Alaric, was the *De civitate Dei*⁷ of Augustine. It occupied him for thirteen years, 413–26; but was published in instalments.⁸ 'The overthrow of Rome', he says in his *Retractations*, 'the pagans endeavoured to connect with the Christian religion. . . . Wherefore I determined to write a treatise, *On the City of God*, in order to refute the mistakes of some and the blasphemies of others.'⁹ The specific charge was no new one. It had been current since the days of the Apologists. Now, however, it was repeated with redoubled emphasis. Men said that the desertion of the gods was the consequence of the spread of the Gospel; and that, irritated at the loss of the honour due to them, they had abandoned the City which, under their protection, had

¹ Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* cxviii, *ut sup.* = liv, § 4 (T. and S.).

² Aug. *Ep.* cxxiv, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 364 c; *P. L.* xxxiii. 473).

³ Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* cxix (*P. G.* xxxiv. 1228) = lxi, § 5 (T. and S.).

⁴ *Epp.* cxxv, cxxvi (*Op.* ii. 364–73; *P. L.* xxxiii. 473–83); Fleury, xxii. xxiii, xxiv.

⁵ *Ep.* cxxv, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 365 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 476).

⁶ H. H. Milman, *Latin Chr.*⁹, i. 130.

⁷ Aug. *Op.* vii (*P. L.* xli. 13–804); Fleury, xxiii. vii–x.

⁸ *De Civ. Dei*, v. xxvi, § 2 (*Op.* vii. 144 A; *P. L.* xli. 174).

⁹ *Retract.* ii. xliii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 56 D, E; *P. L.* xxxii. 647 sq.).

grown to be mistress of the world. Augustine's answer is no mere apology ; but a philosophy of history, past and for to come. The work, he tells us, is divided into two parts : negative in the first ten books, and constructive in the remaining twelve. In Books I-V he refutes the ordinary pagan notion that earthly prosperity is bound up with the worship of the gods and its maintenance. Books V-X are directed against the Neo-platonist position which admits that misfortunes befall the worshippers of the gods ; but contends that they ought, notwithstanding, to be adored for the sake of the happiness they may bestow in a future state.¹ Augustine thus arrives at the constructive part of the treatise, and treats of the two *civitates*, or kingdoms, under which goes on the development of mankind—the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world. The former has for its subjects angels and men ; the essence of the latter is apostasy from God. In the present age alone do these two kingdoms interpenetrate and overlap one another² ; for the citizens of the one move about as pilgrims among the citizens of the other. In Books XI-XIV he describes the origin of the two kingdoms in the creation of angels and the fall of apostate spirits among them. In Books XV-XVIII he treats of their development and progress ; and in Books XIX-XXII of their final issues : sin and its punishment, righteousness and bliss.³ Others before Augustine had taken up the pagan challenge (put out, for instance, in the edict of Maximin the Thracian,⁴ 238) that the disasters of the Empire were due to the forsaking of the gods occasioned by the Christians : Tertullian,⁵ Origen,⁶ Cyprian,⁷ Arnobius,⁸ and Ambrose⁹ in reply to Symmachus. But Augustine's remained the great apology, as the *Te Deum*, the great hymn of victorious Christianity. It is somewhat prolix, and abounds in digressions—often of great value to the historian, the philosopher, and the archaeologist—but still digressions. Yet it is great because of its master-thought, of which the author never loses

¹ *Retract.* II. xliii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 56 sq. ; *P. L.* xxxii. 648).

² *De Civ. Dei*, I. xxxv (*Op.* vii. 30 F ; *P. L.* xli. 46) : see also XI. i (*Op.* vii. 272 E ; *P. L.* xli. 317).

³ *Retract.* II. xliii, § 2 (*Op.* i. 57 ; *P. L.* xxxii. 648).

⁴ *Ap. Eus. H. E.* VI. vii, § 9 : for a good specimen of Augustine's reply to the charge, see *De Civ. Dei*, III. xxxi (*Op.* vii. 86-8 ; *P. L.* xli. 10).

⁵ *Tert. Apol.*, § 40 ; *Ad Scap.*, § 2 ; *De Pall.*, § 2 ; *Ad Nat.* i, § 9.

⁶ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, III, § 15 (*Op.* i. 456 ; *P. G.* xi. 937 B).

⁷ Cyprian, *Ad Demetrianum* (*C. S. E. L.* III. i. 351-70).

⁸ Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, I, §§ 1-3, 15 (*P. L.* v. 718-26, 736).

⁹ Ambrose, *Ep.* xviii, §§ 4-6 (*Op.* II. i. 833 sq. ; *P. L.* xvi. 972 sq.).

sight, that the City of God ' abideth for ever ', though the greatest City of the world has fallen ; and it makes much, in its opening chapters, of ' the great Christian argument ' ¹ that, so far from the fall of Rome being due to the Gospel, the actual siege and capture of the City would have been accompanied by horrors of lust, cruelty, and rapacity far more numerous had not its captors been Christians, and Christian churches been there to shelter the citizens, pagan as well as Christian, who took refuge in them at the word of Alaric.² Augustine had already dwelt upon this triumphal plea for Christianity in his sermon *De Urbis excidio* ; and it forms the *motif* of the *Histories* ³ of Orosius, 417-18. The work was undertaken at the request of Augustine : so says Orosius in the preface ⁴ which, we may note in passing, has a charm of its own, for it is one of the few places in ancient literature where dogs are mentioned with feeling. ' They alone, of all creatures, are on the look out to do what the master wants : only, they wait for his nod. ' ⁵ And it was meant to be an appendix to the *De Civitate Dei*.⁶ Here the reader should find proof—in a survey of history from Adam to the year 417—that, before the coming of our Lord, mankind was subject to more wars, misfortunes, and evils of every kind than since His appearance on earth. It was not the case therefore that the introduction of Christianity and the abandonment of the gods were responsible for the invasions of the barbarians ; from whom Orosius had fled, out of Spain, to take refuge in Africa. His *Histories* and the *De Civitate Dei* were the favourite books of the educated ⁷ in the Middle Ages. Bede, in the earlier chapters of his *History*,⁸ relies on Orosius, and King Alfred translated him into Anglo-Saxon ⁹ ; while Charlemagne had the *De Civitate Dei* read to him at meals.¹⁰ For its ideals were the inspiration of the Holy Roman Empire ; and the papacy, from Gregory VIII to Innocent III, embodied them in practice.¹¹

¹ H. H. Milman, *Latin Chr.* ⁹ i. 132 n.

² *De Civ. Dei*, I. vii (*Op.* vii. 7 ; *P. L.* xli. 19 sq.), and Document No. 204.

³ Orosius, *Op.* 1-587 (*P. L.* xxxi. 663-1174).

⁴ *Ibid.* (*Op.* 1 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 663).

⁵ *Ibid.* (*Op.* 1 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 665 A) ; another such place is Tobit, v. 16, xi. 4.

⁶ *Ibid.* (*Op.* 4 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 667).

⁷ S. Dill, *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire*, 70 sqq.

⁸ Bede, *H. E.* i. 1-10.

⁹ *King Alfred's Orosius*, ed. H. Sweet (E.E.T.S., 1883).

¹⁰ Einhardus, *Vita*, § 24 (*Mon. Germ. Hist.* ii. 456).

¹¹ A. Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, 219 sq.

CHAPTER III

THE EAST, c. 410

THE East, while Rome was thus being besieged, experienced a change of rulers, civil and ecclesiastical.

§ 1. On the death of Arcadius, 1 May 408, Theodosius II,¹ 408–†50, ascended the throne, a boy in his eighth year.² He reigned but he never ruled. For after the administration of Anthemius,³ 408–14, which protected his minority, Theodosius grew up to be weak and devout,⁴ and power passed into the hands of his sister Pulcheria,⁵ 399–†453. She was only two years older than himself; but ‘she received the title Augusta,’ 4 July 414, and ‘continued to govern the Empire near forty years’.⁶ She and her two sisters, the princesses Arcadia and Marina, lived the life of Religious; and the palace of Theodosius II bore the aspect more of a Convent than of a Court.⁷ But Pulcheria understood not only the practice of religion but also the art of government. She provided for her brother, first, suitable occupation in painting and illuminating; and then, for a wife, Athenais, who became the Empress Eudocia,⁸ 421–†60, but was ultimately forced into seclusion at Jerusalem, 444, on suspicion of unfaithfulness to her husband, by the ‘superior ascendant’⁹ of her sister-in-law; but, all the time, Pulcheria ruled discreetly in his name, over an undistracted and prosperous empire. She was a princess of thoroughly noble character: and ‘alone, among the descendants of the great Theodosius, appears to have inherited any share of his manly spirit and abilities’.¹⁰

The Eastern Patriarchates also passed under new rulers about this time.

¹ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 1–132; Gibbon, xxxii (iii. 386 sqq.).

² He was born 10 April 401, Fleury xxi. vii; Hodgkin, i. ii. 44 sq.

³ Socr. *H. E.* vii. i. He built the Theodosian Walls, which now enclose the ancient Stamboul. The walls of Constantine were demolished, but their site marked by columns. Dissenters were only allowed places of worship between the columns and the new wall; hence their name *Ἐξακτιονῖται* (mainly Eunomians), Thdt. *Haer. Fab. Compend.* iv, § 3 (*Op.* iv. 358; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 421 B).

⁴ For his character see Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxii; Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxvi, xxxvii; Fleury, xxiv. xxx.

⁵ For Pulcheria see Soz. *H. E.* ix. i–iii; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 171–84.

⁶ Gibbon, xxxii (iii. 384).

⁷ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxi, § 5.

⁸ Ibid., § 9.

⁹ Gibbon, xxxii (iii. 389).

¹⁰ Ibid. (iii. 385).

§ 2. At Constantinople, next but one in succession to Chrysostom, Atticus had become bishop, 406–†25. He was prudent¹ and smooth-tongued.² The Joannites disclaimed his communion, and desired that Chrysostom's name should be commemorated on the diptychs. But Atticus would not consent; to do so would be to nullify his own episcopate; and the schism remained for the present.³ So also did the separation of Arian from Catholic. The Arian bishop, Dorotheus, dying in extreme old age, was succeeded by Barba; and in his day two distinguished presbyters, Timothy and George, gave fresh life to Arianism. Timothy was a devoted student of Origen; and Socrates tells us that, while he himself had spoken with Timothy, he could never understand how it was that Origen's admirers could remain Arians when Origen himself had taught that the Son was coeternal with the Father.⁴ Socrates forgets that there was another side to Origen's teaching; and that it is human to take as much as you like of an authority and to leave the rest.

§ 3. At Alexandria Theophilus was nearing his end.

(1) Before he died he consecrated the eccentric philosopher and sportsman, Synesius,⁵ to be bishop of Ptolemais, 410–†13, and metropolitan of the Pentapolis. Synesius was born c. 370–5, of an ancient and noble family⁶ at Cyrene, who still clung to their original paganism. He studied philosophy at Alexandria, as one of the pupils of Hypatia, who playfully nicknamed him Mr. Other-folk's-friend⁷; and, on his return home, though barely thirty years of age, he was sent to Court by the oppressed cities of the Pentapolis to see if he could secure for them some relief from excessive taxation. It was while on this mission that he delivered before Arcadius that candid but futile lecture *On Kingship*,⁸ 399, of which

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. ii, § 1, xxv, § 1; Soz. *H. E.* viii. xxvii, § 5.

² *Ibid.*, § 4.

³ For his slowness to consent, see Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxiv, § 13, and Innocent, *Ep.* xxii (*P. L.* xx. 545 A) = Jaffé, No. 308. He gave in, at last, about 415: see Socr. *H. E.* v. xxv, § 2; and the correspondence between Atticus and Cyril of Alexandria in Cyril, *Epp.* lxxv, lxxvi (*Op.* x. 204–8; *P. G.* lxxvii. 348–60); Fleury, xxiii. xxvii.

⁴ Socr. *H. E.* vii. vi. 6–8. Socrates wrote the history of 306–439, under Theodosius II: see Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 119–22; and Sozomen, that of 324–415, between 443–50, *ibid.* 123–7.

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 499–554; Fleury, xxii. xli–xlv; *D. C. B.* iv. 757–80; Alice Gardner, *Synesius of Cyrene* (S.P.C.K. 1886); T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters*, c. xiv; and C. Kingsley, *Hypatia*.

⁶ *Ep.* lvii (*Op.* 197; *P. G.* lxvi. 1393 B).

⁷ *Ep.* lxxx (*Op.* 228; *P. G.* lxvi. 1433 A); for Hypatia, Socr. *H. E.* vii. xv.

⁸ *Orat. de Regno*, *Op.* 1–32 (*P. G.* lxvi. 1053–1112); Hodgkin, i. ii. 685: and Document No. 119.

we have spoken as an unintended satire and an authority, therefore, of first importance, on the Empire as it was at the opening of the fifth century. After this patriotic and, but for the lethargy of Arcadius, dangerous enterprise, Synesius returned to his books and his country life.¹ In 409, the clergy and people of Ptolemais surprised him by demanding him as their bishop; for he was still a pagan. But the country-side was being overrun by marauders.² He was the only young man they knew of who had given evidence of good abilities. They were determined to have him; and it is the picture of the times and the man, reflected in letters which arose out of this request, that gives to Synesius exceptional interest. Writing to his brother at Alexandria, he says³ that he would be wanting in feeling if he did not acknowledge the kindness of the people in Ptolemais. But a bishop ought to be a heavenly person. He ought to do as much business by himself as all the rest put together⁴: and 'I am much too easy-going'. Besides, 'I have a wife whom I have received from God, and the sacred hand of Theophilus'.⁵ We may note in passing that this is an instance, though the only instance on record, of a pagan husband being married to a Christian lady with the blessing of the Church.⁶ 'I am not willing to separate myself from her: but I hope to have virtuous children by her: and Theophilus ought to know this. Then there are other impediments—my views, for instance, about the Resurrection⁷; and my sporting-dogs: I cannot give these up.'⁸ But these objections were quickly overruled, and Synesius was consecrated: family-man as he was, with the liberal views of a philosopher and the tastes of a country-squire. Once a bishop, he studiously maintained the traditions of his office, while acknowledging that he felt himself new to them. Thus, he writes to Theophilus⁹ to tell him how he had entertained, but had not admitted to communion, a bishop who had been consecrated by 'John [Chrysostom] of happy memory: suffer me so to speak of him, since he is dead, and all disputes ought to end with this life. You know better than any man the circumstances of this affair; and I understand you have been writing to Atticus to prevail with

¹ *De insomniis*, § 9 (*Op.* 148; *P. G.* lxvi. 1308 D).

² Synesius, *Catastasis*, i (*Op.* 299–304; *P. G.* lxvi. 1565–74).

³ *Ep.* cv (*Op.* 246–50; *P. G.* lxvi. 1481–9); and, for a summary of it, see Fleury, xxii. xli; A. Gardner, 104 sqq.; and Document No. 120.

⁴ 1484 B.

⁵ 1485 B.

⁶ O. D. Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, 495.

⁷ 1485 B.

⁸ 1488 B.

⁹ *Ep.* lxvi (*Op.* 206 sq.; *P. G.* lxvi. 1408 sqq.); Fleury, xxii. xlii.

him to receive the adherents of that party.’¹ Synesius then goes on to say that he knows but little, as yet, of the canons, and has not yet been bishop a year.² He hopes, therefore, that Theophilus will advise him—with all the authority of the throne of St. Mark—whether his treatment of the Joannite refugee was quite in order. Theophilus must have mellowed in his old age for Synesius thus to have ventured upon the mention of Chrysostom: or else it is testimony to the irresistible charm of the writer himself. Certainly, Theophilus took no offence. For, in the next letter,³ we find him issuing a commission to Synesius to regulate matters of Church order in Cyrenaica. Synesius observes that he holds himself ‘bound to carry out, as a sacred law, whatever the throne of the Evangelist should command’⁴: an expression which well illustrates the authority, amounting almost to a tyranny, of the Pope of Alexandria. But most interesting of all the letters of Synesius is that addressed ‘to the bishops of Christendom’, in which he announces his excommunication of Andronicus, the governor of Pentapolis.⁵ Andronicus was a petty tyrant, and had turned the administration of justice into occasion for barbarity. He invented new instruments of torture, and used them without cause or mercy. The people, in their distress, had recourse to Synesius. He first admonished the governor, who, though a Christian, flouted the bishop’s censure. Synesius then proceeded to sentence of excommunication. ‘Be every temple of God shut against Andronicus. . . . Let no one, private person or magistrate, sit at the same table or under the same roof with him. Let the clergy neither talk with him while living, nor assist at his funeral when dead. And, if any one despise this church of Ptolemais because of its insignificance, and receive those whom she has excommunicated, not thinking himself bound to obey because of her poverty, let him know that he dismembers the Church which Jesus Christ desires to be one.’⁶ Never was there a case in which the Church more clearly used her powers in the interests of morality only; and never a better illustration of the vantage-ground she then occupied for its promotion owing to her, as yet, unbroken unity. The principle of it was that any decision of one ‘bishop in matter of discipline should be *ipso facto*

¹ 1409 A.

² 1409 A, B.

³ *Ep.* lxvii (*Op.* 208–17; *P. G.* lxvi. 1412–32); Fleury, xxii. xliii.

⁴ 1412 A.

⁵ *Ep.* lviii (*Op.* 201–3; *P. G.* lxvi. 1399–1404); Fleury, xxii. xlv.

⁶ 1401 c, d; W Bright, *Canons* 2, 16; and Document No. 121.

recognized by all his colleagues.¹ Andronicus submitted²; and, not long after, when he fell into disgrace, Synesius showed that the Church was as strong to befriend the helpless as to overawe the guilty, by interceding for him with the tribunal by which he had been condemned.³ He even went so far as to recommend him to Theophilus.

(2) Not long after, Theophilus died, 15 October, 412.⁴ He had held the see for seven-and-twenty years; and he is a conspicuous instance of the deterioration of character consequent upon the possession of wealth and power by one whose spiritual life burnt low.⁵ Theophilus himself seems to have been aware of it; for, in his dying moments, he turned to the monk beside him and said: 'Happy art thou, Father Arsenius; for thou hast always had this hour before thine eyes.'⁶ He was succeeded by his like-minded nephew, Cyril,⁷ who was bishop of Alexandria 412-†44.

§ 4. Meanwhile Antioch, on the death of Flavian, passed into the hands of Porphyrius,⁸ 404-†13; and the three Eastern Patriarchates were all out of communion with Innocent of Rome, 401-†17, on the question whether the memory of Chrysostom should be honoured by the recitation of his name among departed bishops at the Eucharist.

¹ Bingham, *Ant.* xvi. ii, § 10; and 'It belonged to the very essence of Catholic unity that he who was excommunicate in one church should be held excommunicate in all churches', Newman's note to Fleury, xxviii. xiv (iii. 357, note g).

² *Ep.* lxxii (*Op.* 218; *P. G.* lxvi. 1436 A).

³ *Ep.* lxxxix (*Op.* 230 sq.; *P. G.* lxvi. 1456 D), a beautiful little note, and Document No. 122.

⁴ *Socr. H. E.* vii. vii, § 1; Fleury, xxii. xlvi.

⁵ W. Bright, in *D. C. B.* iv. 1008.

⁶ H. Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, v. iii, § 5 (p. 430).

⁷ *Socr. H. E.* vii. vii, § 4.

⁸ *Socr. H. E.* vii. ix; *Soz. H. E.* viii. xxiv, § 11; *Thdt. H. E.* v. xxxv, § 2.

CHAPTER IV

PELAGIANISM (i) : IN ROME, 400-10

§ 1. THE West, during the reign of Honorius, 395-†423, has for its main interest, in affairs ecclesiastical, the problems about sin and the need of grace that came to the front with the name of Pelagius. Not that he was the first to raise them. They were occupying the minds of earnest Christians at Rome, some ten years, or more, before the sack of the city. All were at one upon the need of holiness, and the duty of a Christian to strive after perfection. But they differed upon the theory of holiness.

Some would say that we attain it and do what is right, because God gives us both the will and the power to accomplish it. In other words, He first starts, and then supports, us by His grace ; for, of ourselves, we can do nothing. If it be asked, Why this inability to do right, unaided ? the answer they would give is that the Fall is the source of all our infirmities, physical or moral, death included. Adam sinned. All his posterity sinned in him. Humanity, therefore, is depraved and sinful, a *massa peccati*¹ or *perditionis*² ; and God, the all-righteous, can find in none who share it any good save that which He puts there by His grace. Augustine was, by the end of the fourth century, looked upon as the foremost representative of this system. He had passed from vice to a life of striving after holiness ; and he felt himself a monument of grace. His theology flowed from his experience.

But there were pious Christians equally in earnest who had no such experience. A man, they would say, is good because he wills it, and takes pains to become so. Certainly, God assists him, but by the gift of a free will, which is part of the original endowment of our nature, to be afterwards reinforced by the illumination of the Law, by the example of our Lord and His saints, and by the purifying of baptism. But whatever good we attain is to be put down to ourselves. We are bound to do it ; for God would never have commanded us to do it, had it not been possible for us to

¹ Aug. *De div. quaest. ad Simplicianum*, i. ii, § 16 (*Op.* vi. 97 c ; *P. L.* xl. 121).

² Aug. *De dono pers.*, § 35 (*Op.* x. 839 g ; *P. L.* xlv. 1014).

fulfil the command. Indeed, we are bidden to be 'perfect'.¹ A man can then be actually without sin; even if sin be taken to include not outward and gross offences only, but imperfections within the soul. Thus each of us starts where our first parents started, free to choose either good or bad. There was no Fall. There is no Original Sin; for sin is a personal and voluntary thing, and only begins where responsibility begins. There is no need of grace. All we have to do is to exert our will, and to use the nature that God gave us. This was the rival theory of sanctity; and of it the exponent, rather than the originator, was Pelagius.

§ 2. Pelagius is generally spoken of as of British,² occasionally as of Scotie,³ origin. A Scot, at this date,⁴ meant an Irishman; and Pelagius may have sprung from an Irish colony settled in what is now south-west Wales or the West of England, for 'Briton' would cover an Irish resident in Britain.⁵ He was a monk⁶ and a layman⁷; in figure a big man,⁸ thick-necked, broad-shouldered,⁹ with but one eye; in personal appearance well-groomed and with a confident bearing.¹⁰ But he was a man of learning and piety also. He spoke Greek and Latin equally well.¹¹ He was an accomplished writer. For character, no less than for ability,¹² he stood high in the esteem of his contemporaries. Augustine speaks of him as 'a man of holy life and no small attainments as a Christian'.¹³ He says that he and his friends, 'though the adversaries of grace were, for continence and good works, men worthy of all praise. They would have sold all that they had to obtain treasure in heaven.'¹⁴ And

¹ Matt. v. 48.

² Aug. *Ep. clxxxvi*, § 1 (*Op. ii.* 663 F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 816); Orosius, *De arb. lib.*, § 12 (*Op.* 598; *P. L.* xxxi. 1182 D); Marius Mercator, *Liber subn.*, § 2 (*P. L.* xlviii. 111 A); Prosper, *De ingratia*, ll. 1, 2 (*Op.* 115; *P. L.* li. 94 B); Bede, *H. E.* i. 10.

³ Jerome, *Prol. in Ieremiam* (*Op. iv.* 836; *P. L.* xxiv. 682 A) and *Prol. in lib. tert. Ier. proph.* (*Op. iv.* 924; *P. L.* xxiv. 758 B).

⁴ And until the eleventh century: see C. Plummer on Bede, *H. E.* i. 10.

⁵ J. B. Bury as quoted in A. Souter, *The Comm. of Pelagius*², (1907).

⁶ Aug. *De gest. Pel.*, § 36 (*Op. x.* 212 B; *P. L.* xlv. 342); *De Haeresibus*, § 88 (*Op. viii.* 25 E; *P. L.* xlii. 47).

⁷ Orosius, *De arb. lib.*, § 4 (*Op.* 591; *P. L.* xxxi. 1177 A); Zosimus, *Ep. iii.*, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 657 A).

⁸ 'That great fat dog of Albion' and 'stuffed out with Scottish porridge', as Jerome calls him (*Prol. in Ier. and in lib. tert. Ier., ut sup.*).

⁹ Orosius, *De arb. lib.*, § 31 (*Op.* 621; *P. L.* xxxi. 120 B).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 16 (*Op.* 602; *P. L.* xxxi. 1185 C).

¹¹ Aug. *De gest. Pel.*, §§ 3, 39 (*Op. x.* 193 C, 213 E; *P. L.* xlv. 321, 343 sq.).

¹² Aug. *De natura et gratia*, §§ 6, 7 (*Op. x.* 130; *P. L.* xlv. 250).

¹³ *De pecc. merit.* iii, § 1 (*Op. x.* 71 D; *P. L.* xlv. 185 sq.): see also § 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* ii, § 25 (*Op. x.* 54 C; *P. L.* xlv. 167); and *Ep. cxi*, § 83 (*Op. ii.* 455 A; *P. L.* xxxiii. 575).

it was from zeal to promote piety that, among his earlier works, Pelagius composed a *Testimoniorum Liber* ¹ or book of Scriptural extracts for devotional reading. Cyprian,² it will be remembered, and the devout, but erratic, Priscillian³ had done the same. It is remarkable testimony to the high character of Pelagius—as indeed of Arius and Nestorius—that not a breath of slander sullied his name ; and that, in an age of bitter controversy. Nor should it be forgotten that error may be the work of good and able men : the evident earnestness of Pelagius in the cause of practical religion is beyond doubt. And, as further proof of it, we may note his intimacy with St. Paulinus of Nola,⁴ who numbered him among his correspondents.⁵

§ 3. Pelagius arrived in Rome at least as early as the pontificate of Anastasius, 399-†401 : perhaps, earlier. For Augustine says that he ‘had lived a long time there’.⁶ High in the esteem of that school of Roman piety which insisted, above all, on the power of the will, he came into contact at Rome, c. 405, with influences from the East. In that year Chrysostom mourns the defection of ‘the monk Pelagius’⁷ ; and on this has been built a supposition that he was acquainted with the author of Pelagianism, and in a measure responsible for it. True, Chrysostom’s language about grace is apt to be defective. He fails, for example, to give due recognition to prevenient grace.⁸ But it is the language of a preacher, zealous to quicken the wills of his hearers ; and his career as a preacher was over before the Pelagian controversy began. Moreover, the controversy belonged to the West ; and, after all, the identification of Chrysostom’s Pelagius with Pelagius of Britain is purely conjectural. Not so conjectural, however, is the connexion between teachers of the East and the British Pelagius, when in Rome. Marius Mercator, fl. 418-60, a native of Africa, who was at Rome c. 417-18, asserts that the opinions ascribed to him had found expression some time before among certain Syrians,

¹ *Contra duas ep. Pel.* iv, § 21 (*Op.* x. 480 D ; *P. L.* xliv. 623). Aug. also refers to it as ‘*Capitulorum liber*’, e. g. *De gest. Pel.*, § 7 (*Op.* x. 195 A ; *P. L.* xliv. 323).

² *C. S. E. L.* III. i. 35-184.

³ *C. S. E. L.* xviii. 107-47.

⁴ Aug. *Ep.* clxxxvi, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 663 G ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 816).

⁵ *De gratia Christi*, § 38 (*Op.* x. 246 C ; *P. L.* xliv. 378).

⁶ *De pecc. orig.*, § 24 (*Op.* x. 263 A ; *P. L.* xliv. 396).

⁷ *Ep.* iv, § 4 (*Op.* iii. 577 A ; *P. G.* lii. 596).

⁸ *In Act. Apost. Hom.* xxviii, § 3 (*Op.* ix. 224 A ; *P. G.* lx. 212) : see W. Bright, *Lessons, &c.*, app. viii, and F. R. Tennant, *The sources of the doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 325 sq.

particularly with Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia 392-†428. Thence they were brought to Rome, under Pope Anastasius, by the Syrian Rufinus. Too astute to give public utterance to them himself, Rufinus communicated them to Pelagius, who first give them to the world in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*.¹ This Rufinus is not to be confounded with Jerome's friend, and afterwards foe, Rufinus of Aquileia ; though he may be the same as ' a holy presbyter Rufinus of Rome ', to whom Caelestius, the disciple of Pelagius, was fond of appealing, and who was, at this time, ' staying in the house of Pammachius ' ² the friend of Jerome. Rufinus of Aquileia would never have stayed there ; and, though it be true that Jerome himself reckons his *quondam* friend as a forerunner of Pelagianism,³ this is merely one of Jerome's controversial statements, and it is well known what they are worth. It is then probable that Pelagius, through the Syrian Rufinus, drew his inspiration, in part, from Theodore of Mopsuestia. If so, there was an historical, as there certainly is a logical, connexion between the two systems ⁴ ; for if we make light of human sin and so of the need of grace, then, logically, we can reduce our demand for a Saviour who is personally divine. But it was in reaction from Western views other than his own, and, in particular, from those already represented by Augustine, that Pelagius declared himself.⁵ About 405, a bishop, in conversation, happened to quote with approval the prayer from the *Confessions* : ' Lord, Thou hast commanded continence ; give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt. ' ⁶ Pelagius was indignant.⁷ He was alarmed at the relaxing effect on moral effort which such a prayer might have. He thought it encouraged indolence ; and he began to insist, in view of the excuses which the easy-going Christians of Rome made for themselves, out of the weakness of

¹ Marius Mercator, *Lib. subn.*, §§ 2, 3 (*P. L.* xlviii. 111 sq.).

² Aug. *De pecc. orig.*, § 3 (*Op.* x. 254 A ; *P. L.* xlv. 387). He may also be the Rufinus of Jerome, *Ep.* lxxxi, § 2 (*Op.* i. 512 ; *P. L.* xxii. 736).

³ Jerome, *Praef. iv in Ieremiam* (*Op.* iv. 965-6 ; *P. L.* xxiv. 794 D).

⁴ For this connexion, note that ' the Nestorian Christ is the natural Saviour of the Pelagian man ' (C. Gore, in *C. Q. R.*, vol. xvi, No. 32 [July 1883], p. 298), and that one may pass either from Pelagianism to Nestorianism (J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Predest.* 101 sq.), or from Nestorianism to Pelagianism (H. B. Swete, *Theodore of Mops. on the minor Epp. of St. Paul*, i. lxxxvii).

⁵ Pelagianism was a reaction from Augustinianism, and not *vice versa* : see Mozley, *Predestination* (ed. 1855), 50, and note ix.

⁶ *Conf.* x, § 40 (*Op.* i. 184 E ; *P. L.* xxxii. 796).

⁷ *De dono pers.*, § 53 (*Op.* x. 851 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 1026).

the flesh and so forth,¹ on the capacity of our nature, as God made it, to do His will. 'Give!' 'Why, you have! It is simply a matter of using the power which by nature God has given us.' Pelagius then began to gather disciples about him; and chief of them was Caelestius.² He, too, was of Irish birth; and, in early years, a man of singular piety who wrote three letters to his parents 'useful for the practice of virtue'.³ He was thus like his master, both in his early development and in his zeal for the promotion of a vigorous Christianity. But yet they differed. Quite the equal of Pelagius in ability,⁴ Caelestius excelled him in outspokenness and love of disputation. 'The one was frank, the other reserved; the pupil was blunt, where the master was not quite straight; or, shall we say, unrestrained, where he was diplomatic'?⁵ Marius Mercator also remarks upon his 'incredible loquacity', by which 'he made many persons partakers of his infatuation'.⁶ And he had all a logician's fondness for dilemma.⁷ His works, the *Contra traducem peccati*⁸ and the *Definitiones*⁹ have perished; but, to judge from a reference to the former in the *Commentary on the Romans*¹⁰ by Pelagius, the absence of a Fall was the main point emphasized in the theory of Caelestius. It was thus that Pelagius and Caelestius propagated their teaching in Rome; until, about 409, on the approach of the Goths, they left together for Sicily and Africa.

§ 4. It is now time to give a brief sketch of their theory, i.e. of Pelagianism as it may be gathered (a) from the fragments of their works¹¹ and of the works of their follower, Julian,¹² bishop of

¹ Pelagius, *Ep. ad Demetriadem*, § 16 (Aug. *Op.* ii. app. 11 E, F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1110) and his *De natura* as referred to in Aug. *De natura et gratia*, §§ 1, 7 (*Op.* x. 127 A, 130 C; *P. L.* xlv. 247, 250).

² Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium*, ii, § 1, and *Liber subn.* Praef., § 4 (*P. L.* xlviii. 83 A. 113 A).

³ Gennadius, *Illustr. Vir. Catalogus*, § 45 (*P. L.* lviii. 1083 B).

⁴ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 5 (*Op.* x. 434 A; *P. L.* xlv. 574).

⁵ *De pecc. orig.*, § 13 (*Op.* x. 258 D; *P. L.* xlv. 391).

⁶ *Liber subn.* Praef., § 4 (*P. L.* xlviii. 113 A).

⁷ *Dissertatio I*, c. v in *ibid.* (*P. L.* xlviii. 279 C, D); and Aug. *De perfectione iustitiae* (*Op.* x. 167-90; *P. L.* xlv. 291-318).

⁸ Marius M., *Comm.* ii, § 9 (*P. L.* xlviii. 86 B).

⁹ Aug. *De perf. iust.*, § 1 (*Op.* x. 167 A; *P. L.* xlv. 293).

¹⁰ Printed in Jerome, *Op.* xi. 645-718: on it, see A. Souter, *The Commentary of Pelagius* (1907).

¹¹ Pelagius wrote (1) *Comm. on St. Paul's Epp.* (Jerome, *Op.* xi; *P. L.* xxx. 645-902); (2) *Ep. ad Demetriadem* (*ib.* *Op.* xi; *P. L.* xxx. 15-45).

¹² *Ad Turbantium lib. iv* and *Ad Florum lib. viii*, to be reconstructed from their refutations in Aug. *Contra Iulianum* (*Op.* x. 497-710; *P. L.* xlv. 641-874); and *Opus imperfectum* (*Op.* x. 873-1386; *P. L.* xlv. 1049-1608).

Eclanum 417-†54, in Campania (now Mirabella, to the south-east of Benevento) ; (b) from the authors who wrote in condemnation of Pelagianism¹ ; and (c) from the Acts of Councils and Letters of Popes concerned in the controversy.²

(1) Pelagianism³ starts from a Stoical conception of human nature, and asserts first the unconditional freedom of the will. Man was created free. This freedom consists in ' the possibility of yielding to, or abstaining from, sin, at pleasure '.⁴ In every free act we have to distinguish three elements—*posse, velle, esse*—being able, willing, being. ' To be able to do this or avoid that, is an affair of nature ; to desire, of the will ; to be, of action. ' I can quite well refrain from willing what is good or from carrying it into action ; but I cannot fail to have the power both to will and to do it. ' The first element then, i.e. the power, belongs properly to God, who gave it me when He made me ; but the other two—to desire and to be—rest with me, because they have their source in my will. And praise is due to me in proportion to my good will and good deeds. ' ⁵ True, according to this doctrine of freedom, man is placed in a position of independence over against God, and merits a reward from Him according to his good will and good works. But this must not blind us to the fact that the motives of Pelagius were of the highest : (a) to plead for God as Creator by ' defending nature ' ⁶ ; and (b) to rouse men to a sense of responsibility by insisting on the unconditioned freedom of the will.⁷

¹ These are (1) Aug., for whose anti-Pelagian writings see *Op.* x (*P. L.* xlv, xlv) ; W. Bright, *The anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine* (1880), with valuable preface ; tr. P. Holmes and M. Dods (3 vols., T. and T. Clark, 1872-6) ; and Aug. *De Haeresibus*, § 88 (*Op.* viii. 25 sq. ; *P. L.* xlii. 47 sq.) ; (2) Orosius, *De arb. lib.* (*Op.* 588-634 ; *P. L.* xxxi. 1173-1212) ; (3) Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium* (*P. L.* xlviii. 63-108), and *Liber subnotationum* (ib. 109-72) ; (4) Prosper of Aquitaine †463 (the champion of Aug. against Semi-Pelagianism), *De ingratis* (*P. L.* li. 91-148) ; *Contra Collatorem* [i. e. Cassian †435] (*P. L.* li. 214-76).

² Collected in *Varia scripta ad hist. Pel. pert.*, i. e. the appendix to Aug. *Op.* x. 63-162 (*P. L.* xlv. 1679-1792) ; and A. Bruckner, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Pelagianischen Streites* (1906).

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 561 sqq. ; Fleury, xxiii-xxiv ; J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Predestination*, c. iii ; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* i-lxviii ; *Lessons*, 157 sqq. ; *Waymarks*, 182 sqq. ; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, ii. 432-505 ; H. W. Robinson, *The Chr. Doctr. of Man*, 178-95.

⁴ Pelagius, *Libellus Fidei*, § 13 (*Op.* x, app. 97 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 1718) ; and Julian in *Opus imperf.* i, § 78 (*Op.* x. 920 E ; *P. L.* xlv. 1102).

⁵ Pelagius, *Pro libero arbitrio*, ap. Aug. *De gratia Christi*, § 5 (*Op.* x. 231 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 362), and Document No. 130.

⁶ Aug. *De nat. et gratia*, §§ 25, 39 (*Op.* x. 138 D, 143 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 259 sq., 266).

⁷ *De gest. Pel.*, § 5 (*Op.* x. 194 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 322).

(2) The *possibility* of living without sin followed as a second assertion. Objection was taken to the unconditioned freedom of choice on the ground that the will had been impaired from the first, and so found itself *ab initio* inclined toward evil. This the Pelagians resolutely denied.¹ Freedom, according to them, is like a pair of scales nicely balanced and capable of being inclined either way²; but by the will alone. There is nothing, therefore, to prevent a man living without sin. And, while Pelagius, when on his guard, would go no further than to say, 'What I affirm is that a man *can* be without sin',³ yet, when he could speak his mind to friendly ears, he taught that philosophers before Christ had so lived,⁴ and he prepared lists of Scriptural characters who, in his judgement, had never sinned.⁵

(3) Sin, then, being a purely voluntary thing,⁶ it was asserted, thirdly, that there is no such thing as Original Sin,⁷ i.e. a propensity to sin which we each inherit through our *origo* or birth. This the Pelagians rejected on four grounds. (a) Such a propensity, if it existed, must have a cause. There is no sin but in the will. The cause therefore could not be in the will of the child. It must be in the will of God.⁸ (b) To admit it, would be to admit a sinful or vitiated nature; and that is Manichaeism.⁹ (c) If a sin of nature,

¹ So Caelestius, *Definitio* 9, ap. Aug. *De perf. iust.*, § 9 (*Op.* x. 170 D; *P. L.* xlv. 295).

² *Op. imp.* iii, § 117 (*Op.* x. 1098 B, C; *P. L.* xlv. 1297).

³ So Pelagius in his *De natura*, ap. Aug. *De nat. et gr.*, § 8 (*Op.* x. 130 F; *P. L.* xlv. 251); and *De gest. Pel.*, § 16 (*Op.* x. 200 B; *P. L.* xlv. 329).

⁴ *Ad Demetriadem*, §§ 3, 8 (Aug. *Op.* ii. app. 6 D, 8 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1101, 1104 sq.).

⁵ Aug. *De nat. et gratia*, § 42 (*Op.* x. 144 F; *P. L.* xlv. 267).

⁶ So Caelestius in *Def.* 2, ap. *De perf. iust.*, § 2 (*Op.* x. 168 B; *P. L.* xlv. 293).

⁷ The phrase *Originale peccatum* is first used by Augustine in his *De div. quaest. ad Simplicianum* [A. D. 397], I. i, § 11 (*Op.* vi. 85 B; *P. L.* xl. 107). It was probably suggested by 'originis iniuriam' of Ambrose, as quoted by Aug. in *Contra duas epp. Pel.* iv, § 29 (*Op.* x. 488 E; *P. L.* xlv. 632) from Ambrose, *Apol. proph. David*, i, § 56 (*Op.* i. i. 694; *P. L.* xiv. 873 C). Ambrose goes back to 'contagium mortis antiquae' of Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiv, § 5 (*C. S. E. L.* III. ii. 720); and Cyprian, in turn, to his 'master' Tertullian's 'ex originis vitio' (*De anima*, § 41). On this succession, see F. R. Tennant, *The Fall and Original Sin*, 333, 336, 340. Augustine makes clear what he means by 'peccatum' in this connexion (not 'a sin' [ἀμαρτία] but a sinful condition [ἀμαρτία]), by using, instead, such words as 'vitium' (*De nat. et gratia*, § 3 [*Op.* x. 129 D; *P. L.* xlv. 249]), 'aegritudo' (ib., § 22 [*Op.* x. 136 A; *P. L.* xlv. 257]), 'labes' (*De Sp. et litt.*, § 48 [*Op.* x. 111 B; *P. L.* xlv. 230]), and 'tabes' (*Op. imp. c. Iul.* vi, § 8 [*Op.* x. 1297 E; *P. L.* xlv. 1513]).

⁸ Caelestius, *Def.* 4, ap. *De perf. iust.*, § 4 (*Op.* x. 169 A; *P. L.* xlv. 294).

⁹ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* vi, §§ 8, 21 (*Op.* x. 1297, 1328 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 1513, 1548).

it would be indelible.¹ (d) If Adam could thus transmit his sin to his descendants, why could not a good man similarly transmit his goodness? ² and why should not other sins be, in like manner, transmitted? ³ There is no such thing then as transmission of sin : each of us starts anew : and, if our first parents did us any harm, it was simply by bad example.

(4) But, fourthly, not only is there no Original Sin,⁴ there was also no Fall. It would have been possible to deny Original Sin, and yet to recognize a Fall, i.e. to allow that death, disease, ignorance, and concupiscence came into the world as a consequence of Adam's sin. But this would have been to admit that our nature, as God made it, has been impaired ; and that Adam was created in a condition superior to that in which we now find ourselves. But this is impossible ; nature is as sufficient now, as ever it was. ' Adam ', therefore, ' was created mortal : and, had he sinned or not sinned, would still have died.' ⁵ The institution of marriage before he sinned is proof of this ; for the purpose of marriage is to fill up the voids caused by death.⁶ Further proof is to be seen in the continuance of death since Christ came ; for, if death were the consequence of sin, then the removal of sin ought to have effected the abolition of death.⁷ The threat, then, ' Ye shall surely die ', had reference not to bodily death, but to the spiritual death of sin ⁸ ; and ' Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return ', so far from announcing a penalty, was simply a promise that the troubles of life were to have an end.⁹ No doubt the troubles of Adam and Eve increased after their sin ; but they affected themselves only and not their descendants.¹⁰

(5) Similarly, in the fifth place, with regard to concupiscence. They had it as well as we ; both in the wider sense of desiring what is forbidden,¹¹ and in the form of sexual concupiscence.¹² That is

¹ *Op. imp. c. Iul.*, i, § 61 (*Op.* x. 92 c ; *P. L.* xlv. 1081).

² *Marius Merc. Comm.* ii, § 10 (*P. L.* xlviii. 87 sq.).

³ *Op. imp. c. Iul.*, vi, § 21 (*Op.* x. 1329 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 1547).

⁴ For an explicit denial by Pelagius of Original Sin, see his words quoted in *Aug. De pecc. orig.*, § 14 (*Op.* x. 258 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 391), and Document No. 131.

⁵ *Caelestius ap. De gest. Pel.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204 c ; *P. L.* xlv. 333).

⁶ *Op. imp.* vi, § 30 (*Op.* x. 1359 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 1580).

⁷ *Ibid.* ii, § 93 (*Op.* x. 988 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 1173).

⁸ *Ibid.* vi, § 30 (*Op.* x. 1359 E ; *P. L.* xlv. 1580).

⁹ *Ibid.* vi, § 27 (*Op.* x. 1348 A ; *P. L.* xlv. 1568).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* vi, § 27 (*Op.* x. 1348 C ; *P. L.* xlv. 1568).

¹¹ *Ibid.* i, § 71 (*Op.* x. 913 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 1094).

¹² *Ibid.* iii, § 202 (*Op.* x. 1130 E ; *P. L.* xlv. 1336).

part and parcel of our bodily nature ; as such, our Lord had it ; and to see in it something evil, or a consequence of sin, is Manichæan.¹ The matter may be clinched in one phrase of Caelestius : ' Infants newly born are in that condition in which Adam was before he sinned.'² And, if it be asked how then do Pelagius and his friends account for the ease with which we fall into sin and for the universality of sin, they would reply that this has nothing to do with our racial past, it is from force of habit. Sin with each of us becomes second nature.³

(6) Such an account of sin led, sixthly, to a new doctrine of grace and of the means of grace.

As to the means of grace, baptism of infants was the universal practice of the Church of the fifth century. How then are we to maintain that it is for remission of sins in the case of innocent children ? The Pelagians did not maintain it. They retained infant baptism,⁴ and even anathematized those who affirmed that it was not necessary⁵ ; but, they added, the grace of baptism is not the same for all. In the case of adults it is medicinal and regenerating. In the case of infants, it is sanctifying only. ' Those whom Christ made good by creation, He makes better by renewal and adoption.' With infants, baptism looks not to the past but to the future ; it has no cleansing, but only a benedictory, effect ; for what infants receive at the font is ' spiritual illumination, adoption as children of God, citizenship of the heavenly Jerusalem, sanctification and membership in Christ, with inheritance in the kingdom of heaven'.⁶ Pelagians made a distinction between the kingdom of heaven and eternal life. Life eternal infants could attain without baptism⁷ ; but baptism was necessary for admission to the kingdom.⁸

With this limited view of the need and the grace of baptism, went an equally limited conception of Grace⁹ itself. Medicinal or

¹ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* iv, §§ 45-64 (*Op.* x. 1160-70 ; *P. L.* xlv. 1365-76).

² *De gest. Pel.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 334).

³ *Ep. ad Demetriadem*, § 8 (*Aug. Op.* ii, app. 8 D ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1104 sq.).

⁴ *Libellus Fidei*, § 7 (*Op.* x, app. 97 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 1718).

⁵ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* iv, § 2 (*Op.* x. 467 C ; *P. L.* xlv. 609).

⁶ *Op. imp.* i, § 53 (*Op.* x. 897 ; *P. L.* xlv. 1076), and Document No. 217.

⁷ So Caelestius, *ap. De gest. Pel.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 334).

⁸ *De pecc. merit.* i, § 26 (*Op.* x. 15 A ; *P. L.* xlv. 123).

⁹ On the meaning of the word Grace : (1) we must distinguish (a) its meaning in Scripture = ' favour ' (W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, on Rom. i. 5) from (b) its ecclesiastical meaning = ' help ', as in Aug. *Enchiridion*, § 28 (*Op.* vi. 237 ; *P. L.* xl. 282, ' divinum adiutorium '), or *Ep.* clxxv, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 618 C ; *P. L.* xxxiii, ' auxilium '). (2) The connexion between the

recreative grace is not wanted ; for our nature is not diseased but sound.¹ But what of grace to avoid what is wrong and to do what is right ? Is there any room for assisting grace ? Pelagius admitted it, though Caelestius denied it absolutely² ; and Julian recognized it as necessary only for supernatural attainments.³ ‘ I anathematize ’, said Pelagius, ‘ him who thinks or says that the grace of God by which Christ came into this world to save sinners is not necessary, not only every hour or every moment but for every act.’⁴ But it is necessary not in order to do right, but ‘ to do it *more easily* ’.⁵ Accordingly, by grace he meant something less than the supernatural assistance of the Holy Spirit reinforcing the will from within. Grace consists, according to Pelagians, in the endowments bestowed upon a man at his creation, in the superiority to the brute beasts which we owe to our possession of reason and free-will, in the daily blessings of Providence, in the Mosaic Law, in the Incarnation of our Lord as moving us to the love of God,⁶ but above all in the illumination of His teaching and His example.⁷ Grace, therefore, in the view of Pelagius, operates on the will, in the

two is that, whereas we may feel kindly towards a man without going on to help him, with God there is no such breach between feeling and action. With him, to favour is to bless. (3) But it is important, for exegetical and doctrinal purposes, to note this distinction : see J. J. Lias, *The doctrinal system of St. John*, 257 sqq. ; J. P. Norris, *Rudiments of Theology*, 120 sqq., and B. J. Kidd, *Articles*, ii. 129 sq. (4) When we think of ‘ grace ’ as a ‘ gift ’, of χάρις as χάρισμα, it is important not to separate the gift from the Giver. ‘ The infusion of grace is merely a convenient theological expression for the personal action of the Divine Paraclete ’ (W. Bright, *Lessons*, 162, n. 3). Grace is not something which God gives, and says ‘ Take it, or leave it ’, but His personal action. It simply means the Holy Spirit at work in the soul. God does not bestow something on us : He works it in us. ‘ The power that worketh in us ’ (Eph. iii. 20) is the biblical expression for grace in its ecclesiastical sense. To forget this, is to expose the doctrine of the means of grace, or the sacraments, to the charge of being so much mechanism, by overlooking the personal connexion they set up or maintain between the soul and its God. But Catholicism is not opposed to Evangelicalism. Augustine uses ‘ Grace ’ and the ‘ Holy Spirit ’ as synonyms, e. g. *De Sp. et litt.*, § 5 ; *De nat. et gratia*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 87, 138 c ; *P. L.* xlv. 203, 259). (5) For the best descriptions of what ‘ Grace ’ means, see J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. of Predestination*, 323 ; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* x ; H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, i. 44, 66, ii. 34, 188 ; *Advent Sermons*, i. 234 ; *Christmas Sermons*, 217 ; F. Paget, *Faculties and Difficulties*², 188 sqq. ; I. von Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*², 184, 191.

¹ *De nat. et gratia*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 138 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 259).

² *De gest. Pel.*, § 42 (*Op.* x. 215 A, B ; *P. L.* xlv. 345).

³ *Op. imp.* iii, § 106 (*Op.* x. 1092 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 1291).

⁴ *De grat. Chr.*, § 2 (*Op.* x. 229 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 360).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 27 (*Op.* x. 243 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 374).

⁶ *Op. imp.* i, § 94 (*Op.* x. 928 ; *P. L.* xlv. 1111).

⁷ *De grat. Chr.*, § 8 (*Op.* x. 233 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 364).

main, *ab extra*, and, moreover, it rests with us, by making good use of our free-will, to deserve it.¹ There could, therefore, be no predestination of a soul² irrespective of foreseen deserts³; for the first steps towards salvation are taken by the unaided forces of our nature, grace coming in afterwards in order to make the attainment of it easier.⁴

Such, in outline, is the system of Pelagius. Put more briefly, it resolves itself into 'two main propositions: (1) We do not need supernatural Grace, because (2) We do not bring into the world with us Original Sin. In the development of his theory, Pelagius probably began by laying down the former, and then went on at once to provide it with a basis in the latter. Pelagianism, in one word, is Naturalism⁵; and, as such, like Arianism, a retrograde movement toward paganism.⁶ We now proceed, in the next two chapters, to trace its history up to its condemnation in the West.

¹ *De grat. Chr.*, § 34 (*Op.* x. 244 sq.; *P. L.* xliv. 376 sq.).

² *Aug. De praedest. sanct.*, § 36 (*Op.* x. 814 c; *P. L.* xliv. 987).

³ *De gest. Pel.*, § 42 (*Op.* x. 215 c; *P. L.* xliv. 345)—an extreme opinion about merit, in which Caelestius stood alone.

⁴ *De grat. Chr.*, § 27 (*Op.* x. 243 B; *P. L.* xliv. 374). For a list of the incomplete senses in which Pelagians admitted grace, see D. Petavius, *De Pelagianorum . . . Historia*, ii, § 4 (*Op.* iii. 596: Paris, 1644), and W. Bright, *Lessons*, app. xix.

⁵ 'Pelagius, by denying Original Sin, argued against the necessity for redemption, and struck at the root of Christianity,' J. Michelet, *History of France*, i. 30 (tr. G. H. Smith); J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 52, 103; and, for a defence of the denial, J. B. Bury, *St. Patrick*, 43 sq.

⁶ C. Merivale, *The Conversion of the Northern Nations*, 48 sqq. (1866), and a striking story in Hefele, ii. 446, n. 3.

CHAPTER V

PELAGIANISM (ii) : IN AFRICA, 410-15

THE events of the Pelagian controversy are grouped into four stages ; and they occurred (i) in Africa, 410-15, where they centre upon Caelestius and called for the intervention of Augustine ; (ii) in Palestine, 415-16, where Pelagius was the protagonist and both Jerome and Theodore entered the lists ; (iii) in Rome and Africa, 416-18, where the matter was taken up officially by the Popes and the African episcopate and hastened to a conclusion by the rescript of Honorius, 30 April 418. These events will occupy us in this chapter and the next. Chapters VII and VIII will be devoted to (iv) the aftermath of the controversy, in the struggle between Augustinianism and semi-Pelagianism, 418-31, and to a brief review of the developments which issued in the Catholic doctrine of Grace, 431-529.

§ 1. On the approach of the Goths, Pelagius and Caelestius left Rome for Sicily. There they left the germs of their teaching to work ; for, five years afterwards, three propositions embodying it were addressed to Augustine for an answer by a layman of Syracuse named Hilary.¹ But it was only a flying visit ; and they crossed to Africa. Pelagius visited Hippo, but kept his counsel there. Thence he went to Carthage, where Augustine, who had already heard of his opinions, saw him once or twice. But he was then wholly absorbed in the Conference with the Donatists, 411 ; and, meanwhile, Pelagius left Carthage for Palestine. Caelestius remained ; and, on his endeavouring to obtain priest's Orders at Carthage,² he was denounced for heresy to Aurelius,³ by the deacon Paulinus, who was then living at Carthage as the agent of the Church of Milan⁴ and, at the suggestion of Augustine, was busy with the life of St. Ambrose.⁵

§ 2. Aurelius dealt with the accusation by summoning the

¹ Aug. *Epp.* clvi, clvii (*Op.* ii. 542-59 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 673-93) ; and *De gest. Pel.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204 F ; *P. L.* xlv. 334), and Document No. 180.

² *Ep.* clvii, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 552 D ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 685).

³ Marius Merc. *Comm.*, § 1 (*P. L.* xlviii. 68 sq.).

⁴ *Praedestinatus* [c. A. D. 450], lxxxviii (*P. L.* liii. 617 D) ; on this work, see Bardenhewer, 604.

⁵ Ambrose, *Op.* i (*P. L.* xiv. 27-46) ; Bardenhewer, 514 sq.

Council of Carthage,¹ 411-12.² Augustine was not present³; and it was for Paulinus to establish the charges he had made. He presented a memorial, accusing Caelestius of maintaining that (1) Adam was created mortal and, whether he sinned or not, he was to have died; (2) The sin of Adam injured himself alone, and not the race; (3) Infants newly born are in the same state in which Adam was before he sinned; (4) The death or sin of Adam is not the cause of the death of all mankind, nor the resurrection of Christ of the resurrection of all mankind; (5) The Law brings men to the kingdom of heaven in the same way as does the Gospel; (6) Even before the coming of the Lord there were impeccable men, i.e. men without sin.⁴ Augustine has preserved for us a fragment of the debate which followed upon the presentation of these articles⁵; and it will be observed that, while any one adopting them would be committed to a direct denial of the Fall and to an indirect repudiation of the need of Redemption, he would have expressed no opinion on the hereditary transmission of sin. On that point the propositions incriminated were silent. But the point was immediately raised in debate; and Caelestius took advantage of the loophole left him to protest, with reference to the second proposition, that it was an open question—this, of the transmission of sin—and that he knew several presbyters, ‘among them Rufinus of Rome, the guest of Pammachius, who denied original sin’. The Council passed the matter over for the moment, and made no objection to the refusal of Caelestius to commit himself to an assertion of the transmission of sin. But, in the discussion of the third proposition, it came up again as an inference from the practice of Infant Baptism so as quite to take the innovators by surprise. Pelagius, in his *Commentary on St. Paul’s Epistles*, had never said a word of the baptism of infants; and Caelestius now professed ‘I have always affirmed that infants need baptism, and ought to be baptized’—no less than adults—‘for the remission of sins’, as he added some years later.⁶ What the Council wanted

¹ Mansi, iv. 289-300; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 168 sqq. (*E. Tr.* ii. 446-8); Aug. *Op.* x, app. ii. 73 sq. (*P. L.* xlv. 1691 sq.).

² For the date, see Aug. *Ep.* clxxv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 617 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 759).

³ *Retract.* ii, § 33 (*Op.* i. 53 sq.; *P. L.* xxxii. 644).

⁴ These six propositions are given in Marius Merc. *Comm.* (*P. L.* xlviii. 69 sq.), and he adds a seventh in *Liber subn.*, § 5 (ib. 114 sq.). Augustine gives the six in *De gest. Pel.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204; *P. L.* xlv. 333 sq.), Document No. 180.

⁵ Aug. *De pecc. orig.*, §§ 2, 3 (*Op.* x. 253 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 386 sq.).

⁶ In his letter to Pope Zosimus, 417, quoted *ibid.*, §§ 5, 6 (*Op.* x. 255; *P. L.* xlv. 368).

to draw from him was, of course, a true statement as to the nature of this need. But on this point, that it was the need of a Redeemer, inasmuch as infants too have Original Sin, Caelestius was evasive. 'What more', he asked, 'does Paulinus want?' Caelestius was condemned, and departed for Ephesus, where he again endeavoured to obtain promotion to the presbyterate.¹ But his condemnation is of less importance than the fact that it was due to collision between his teaching and—not the doctrinal system (for the point in question was, as yet, an open one) but—the institutions of the Church. So strongly established a practice was the baptism of infants at the opening of the fifth century² that the argument to be drawn from it in favour of Original Sin was at once held to be decisive. At a later stage, Pelagianism was to receive a second check from its incompatibility with another institution of the Church, viz. prayer.³ But the check it received when confronted with the universal and settled practice of infant baptism was, for the moment, staggering. Caelestius had apparently quite overlooked the obstacle. He could not deny that infants were baptized, and that their baptism like that of adults, was, as the Creed had it, 'unto remission of sins'. Their sin, however, was not an act of will. It must therefore be a 'sin of nature'⁴; and this simple argument established not only a Fall but Original Sin.⁵ So much was clear: though it was not yet clear in what Original Sin consisted.⁶ It was the task of Augustine to elucidate this; not, indeed, completely, nor quite successfully. He only began the discussion of the problem. It lasted long after

¹ Marius Merc. *Comm.*, § 2 (*P. L.* xlviii. 70-3).

² For passages involving its practice, see Tert. *De baptismo*, § 18; Origen, *In Luc. Hom.* xiv (*Op.* iii. 948; *P. G.* xiii. 1835 B); *In Rom.* v, § 9 (*Op.* iv. 565; *P. G.* xiv. 1047 B), and the well-known passage in Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiv, § 5 (*C. S. E. L.* III. ii. 720), so often quoted by Aug. for the effect of baptism in removing Original Sin, as in *Contra duas epp. Pel.* iv, § 23 (*Op.* x. 482; *P. L.* xlv. 625), and in *Sermo*, cxciv, § 19 (*Op.* v. 1193 D; *P. L.* xxxix. 1347 sq.). Julian of Eclanum had great difficulty in getting rid of the argument for Original Sin from Infant Baptism, e. g. *Contra Iulianum*, ii, §§ 2 sqq. (*Op.* x. 525 sqq.; *P. L.* xlv. 672 sqq.), iii, § 11 (*Op.* x. 558; *P. L.* xlv. 708).

³ *Ep.* clxxv [A. D. 416], § 4 (*Op.* ii. 619 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 761).

⁴ *De pecc. orig.*, § 6 (*Op.* x. 255 F; *P. L.* xlv. 388).

⁵ Caelestius, however, refused to admit the inference, *ibid.*, § 4 (*Op.* x. 255 B; *P. L.* xlv. 387 sq.).

⁶ On this, see J. B. Mozley, *Aug. doctr. Pred.*, c. iv; and for the 'alternative theory' (sc. to the traditional theory) 'supplied by evolution', F. R. Tennant, *The origin and propagation of sin*, 10 sq.

his day ; and the solution to which he pointed was not accepted without qualification.¹

On the departure of Caelestius, with nothing to say, the moment was ripe for the intervention of Augustine, 412—first in sermons, then in writing.

§ 3. Before separating, the Council of Carthage appears to have drawn up counter-propositions to those of Caelestius. But his opinions had obtained some notoriety ; and Augustine, with other bishops, informed of the situation, set himself, ‘in sermons and discussions,’² to counteract them as novelties destructive of true belief in the Redemption. In a group of sermons known to belong to this period,³ we have interesting samples of his arguments against Pelagianism. ‘If man had not perished,’ he says—anticipating the Thomist by contrast with the Scotist view of the cause of the Incarnation⁴—‘the Son of Man would not have come.’⁵ In the next sentence—again anticipating a striking statement by Leontius of Byzantium, 485–†543, of a far-reaching principle⁶—he treats grace not as destructive but as corrective and supplementary of nature. ‘Man perished by free-will ; and the God-man came in grace that makes the will really free.’ Then he comes to the argument from the baptism of infants which the Council had used with such effect upon Caelestius. ‘To say’, he urges, ‘that infancy has nothing for Jesus to save is to deny that Christ is Jesus to Christian infants : and such denial is incompatible with a sound Rule of Faith.’ Then, proceeding on the assumption that there can, in the Christian Church, be no forms for form’s sake, i.e. that Christian ordinances, unlike Jewish, are sacraments,⁷ he contends that baptism, like the rest, must have

¹ For ‘Augustinian exaggerations’, see J. B. Mozley, *Pred.* 131, 155 sq., 163 sq., 208, 297, 323–9, and W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xiii. sq.

² *Retract.* ii, § 33 (*Op.* i. 53 E ; *P. L.* xxxii. 644).

³ *Sermones*, clxx, clxxiv, clxxv, clxxvi (*Op.* v. 818 sqq. ; *P. L.* xxxviii. 926 sqq.) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 576 sqq. ; Fleury, xxiii. ii ; Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l’Église*, ii. 241, n. 1.

⁴ On these rival views, see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 217 sq.

⁵ *Sermo*, clxxiv, § 2 (*Op.* v. 831 B ; *P. L.* xxxviii. 940) ; cf. St. Thos. Aq. *Summa*, III. i. 3.

⁶ Leont. Byz. *Contra Nest. et Eutych.* ii (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 1333 B) : see C. Gore, *Dissertations*, 276, n. 3 (ed. 1907).

⁷ The Church has her ordinances, and yet has not gone back to Judaism, because they are (1) few and simple, (2) not mere ordinances but sacraments : see Aug. *Ep.* liv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 124 A ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 200) ; *De cat. rud.*, § 50 (*Op.* vi. 293 F ; *P. L.* xl. 344) ; and *Sermo*, cclxxii (*Op.* v. 1104 C ; *P. L.* xxxviii. 1247). For the difference between Jewish and Christian

its accompanying grace. If then the rite confers spiritual grace, infants who are brought to it, as also to Confirmation and Communion, must have a spiritual need. What is that need according to the Pelagians? The need, he replies, is of 'saving health'. 'Why run with the child to the doctor if he is not ill?'¹ In a later sermon he declares that 'of all the mass of mankind derived from Adam, there is no one who is not sick, and none is healed save by the grace of Christ . . . and if infants brought to baptism are affirmed to have no inherited sinfulness, then we ought to say in church to those who bring them (not "Suffer little children to come unto me" but) "Take those innocents away!" "They that are whole have no need of a physician but they that are sick." Christ "came not to call the righteous, but sinners".² . . . Let parents make their choice; and either confess that, in their children there is sin to be healed, or else cease to bring them to the Great Physician.'³ Thus Augustine, no doubt, at the instance of archbishop Aurelius, put the faithful at Carthage on their guard against Pelagianism. He developed against Caelestius the argument from the sacrament of Baptism; just as Cyril of Alexandria afterwards urged against Nestorius the argument from the Eucharist.⁴

Augustine was soon asked to deal with the new doctrines, for the benefit not now of the populace but of the educated, in writing. Marcellinus who, as High Commissioner of Honorius, had but lately presided over the Conference of Carthage, 411, was a devout Catholic and a friend of Augustine. He took an intelligent interest in the theological questions of the day,⁵ but was wearied with the question, 'Why should infants be baptized?' and with the impossible answers⁶ which Pelagians gave to it. He wrote to Augustine for his opinion.⁷

§ 4. The reply was the first of the long series of anti-Pelagian treaties; and was entitled *De peccatorum meritis ac remissione et ordinantibus*, see *In Lev. Q.* lxxxiv (*Op.* iii. 524 B; *P. L.* xxxiv. 742 sq.); and *W. Bright, St. Leo* 2, 136.

¹ *Sermo*, clxxiv, § 7 (*Op.* v. 833 sq.; *P. L.* xxxviii. 943 sq.).

² Mark ii. 17, the one place in the Gospels where it is clearly taught that sin is a disease, and our Lord the physician. So the Church is a hospital, where 'curantur aegroti', Pacian, *Ep.* iii, § 4 (*P. L.* xiii. 1066 B).

³ Aug. *Serm.* clxxvi, § 2 (*Op.* v. 840 B; *P. L.* xxxviii. 951): see also *Serm.* cxv, § 4, cxciii, § 11 (*Op.* v. 576, 1181; *P. L.* xxxviii. 657, 1334).

⁴ Cyril, *De recta fide*, § 38 (*Op.* ix. 35; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1189); and *Ep.* xvii (*ad Nest.* iii) (*Op.* x. 72; *P. G.* lxxvii. 113).

⁵ Aug. *Ep.* cxc, § 20 (*Op.* ii. 706 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 864).

⁶ e. g. *De pecc. merit.* i, § 63 (*Op.* x. 35 F, G; *P. L.* xlv. 146 sq.).

⁷ *De gest. Pel.*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 205 D; *P. L.* xlv. 335).

de baptismo parvulorum,¹ 412. In Book I he takes up at once the Pelagian argument, § 2, that Adam would have died not from desert of sin but from necessity of nature. Certainly, § 3, Adam was created mortal ; but had he continued in obedience he would not actually have died ; he would have passed to immortality.² This immortality, § 6, he lost by sin ; and so became subject to death not by the necessity of nature but by the desert of sin, for, § 8, ' by one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin '.³ Then, relying on a mistranslation which makes St. Paul speak of Adam as the one man ' in whom all sinned ',⁴ Augustine proceeds to argue, §§ 9 sqq., that the sin of Adam has implicated all his descendants. No mere imitation of his example, §§ 9, 10, will explain the mystery of sin ; and this is clear from the analogy of justification, § 11, which does not consist in the imitation of Christ but in our incorporation into Him. So condemnation, § 19, has its root not in the mere following of Adam but in our community of nature with him. Thence the treatise travels on naturally to the *rationale* of infant baptism. It is not, § 23, simply that they may be admitted to the kingdom of heaven ; but, § 24, that they are spiritually sick and in need of the Physician. Baptism, in other words, is administered, § 33, to children in order that they may receive remission of original sin. In Book II he shows, by way of attacking the Pelagian notion that perfect sinlessness has been attained by certain persons in this life, that, § 7, though by the grace of God and our own free-will we can be without sin, yet, §§ 8-25, as a matter of fact, no one ever has been sinless, for there are none who have not occasion to say, ' Forgive us our trespasses '. The reason for this is, §§ 26-33, that none desire it so earnestly as they should. Finally, § 34, our Lord alone is without sin. He had scarcely finished these two books when he came across the *Commentary of Pelagius on St. Paul's Epistles*.⁵ Here he found it maintained, in opposition to original sin, that, if the sin of Adam is prejudicial to those who do not sin, the righteousness of Christ

¹ *Op.* x. 1-84 (*P. L.* xliv. 109-200). ' Here are found the *loci classici* for the teaching of St. Augustine on sanctifying grace,' Bardenhewer, 486.

² This is the uniform teaching of the Fathers, see *Ath. De Inc.* iii, § 3, iv, § 6, and Newman, *Select Tr. of Ath.* ii. 1 sq. Contrast the protestant teaching in K. R. Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrine*, § 245.

³ *Rom.* v. 12.

⁴ ' *In quo omnes peccaverunt* ' for ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, on which see R. C. Trench, *St. Aug. as an Interpreter* ⁴, 121, n. 3 (1881).

⁵ *De pecc. merit.* iii, § 1 (*Op.* x. 71 D ; *P. L.* xliv. 186).

is similarly efficacious for those who do not believe.¹ This was the occasion of Book III. It took the form of a letter to Marcellinus in which Augustine shows, § 2, how infants are counted among the faithful and are benefited by what parents and sponsors do for them. Such is the first anti-Pelagian treatise ; in which Augustine is careful to attack opinions only, and not names ; and, when he is obliged to mention Pelagius by name, to speak of him in terms of high regard.²

§ 5. A letter from an inquirer named Honoratus drew from Augustine a pamphlet *De gratia Novi Testamenti*,³ before Marcellinus had digested the *De peccatorum meritis*. Marcellinus found a difficulty in Augustine's handling of the question of sinlessness ; for he could not reconcile the possibility of a man's being without sin with the actual fact of none being sinless save our Lord. This was the occasion of the second anti-Pelagian treatise, *De Spiritu et littera*,⁴ written toward the end of 412. Scripture gives us, § 1, several examples, says Augustine, of things that are possible but have never happened. Marcellinus, however, will reply, § 2, that they are such as God alone can do ; whereas for a man to be without sin belongs to the sphere of human action. It does so belong ; but it is also the gift of God, and therefore a work which God alone can do. The gift in question, § 5, is not merely that of free-will, but of Grace, i.e. of the Holy Spirit at work in the soul.⁵ For, § 6, law without love is but ' the letter that killeth ' ; good as it is, it only serves to excite by its prohibitions the desire for what is forbidden.⁶ But when ' the love of God hath been shed abroad in the heart through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us ',⁷ then desire is changed into love of what the law commands, and so ' the Spirit giveth life '. Thus, § 7, a good life, as being within the power of God, is possible for us ; although, in His wisdom, He has allowed no instance of it. Augustine then goes on to contrast, §§ 8-32, the work of ' the letter ' with that of ' the Spirit ' ; §§ 33-42, what was attainable under the Old Covenant with what Grace can effect under the New ; §§ 43-9, the capacities of Nature with the possibilities of Grace. Christ, §§ 50-1, is thus the only source of righteousness ; and, §§ 52-60, it is only by Grace that the will is

¹ *De pecc. merit.* iii, § 2 (*Op.* x. 71 F ; *P. L.* xliv. 187).

² *Ibid.*, §§ 5, 6 (*Op.* x. 73 c, 74 B ; *P. L.* xliv. 188 sq.).

³ *Ep.* cxi (*Op.* ii. 422-56 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 558-77).

⁴ *Op.* x. 85-126 (*P. L.* xlv. 201-46).

⁵ Document No. 176.

⁶ Rom. vii. 7, 11.

⁷ Rom. v. 5.

⁸ 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

set really free. He concludes, §§ 61-6, by reverting to the occasion and purpose of the treatise which was to show that sinlessness, or a holy life, is the work of God ; done indeed through man but none the less the work of God. But no summary can do justice to a treatise like this. Its contribution to the permanent enrichment of religion lies in the working out of the contrast between ' the letter and the Spirit ' which Augustine found in St. Paul. Without ignoring all reference in the phrase to the contrast between the literal and the figurative sense of Scripture, to which he had learned from St. Ambrose¹ to attach great weight, he read the words, in the light of their context and of St. Paul's experience as given in *Rom.* vii. 7-25, to mean that ' our sufficiency is of God '. He took ' the letter which killeth ' to be law,² considered as an *ab extra* system of mere precept and prohibition. Such law may enlighten the conscience as to duty³ ; but it has an imperative and minatory⁴ tone. It sounds like a prohibitive mandate ; and so, owing to the very contrariness of human nature,⁵ it only irritates into rebellion⁶ and fails of its purpose. It neither awakens the feeling of love⁷ for the commandment, nor gives grace and power to fulfil it.⁸ Thus ' the letter killeth ' because it remains, as it came, *ab extra*. But where the Law failed, as in St. Paul's experience described in *Rom.* vii. 7-25,⁹ the Gospel succeeded. The one was ' letter '—mere written enactment ; the other is ' Spirit '. For we Christians have a life-giving presence of the Holy Spirit which, by inwardly uplifting the will¹⁰ and writing the law of God in the heart,¹¹ imparts justification on condition of faith¹² ; and thereby produces an obedience prompted by love¹³

¹ *Conf.* vi, § 6 (*Op.* i. 122 B ; *P. L.* xxxii. 722).

² For this exposition, see W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xix-xxi.

³ *De Sp. et litt.*, § 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, §§ 13, 16, 22.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 25.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 26.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 32.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 25.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 20.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 29, 36, 42.

¹² *Ibid.*, §§ 15, 16, 45, 51. In § 45 note ' Quid est enim aliud iustificati quam iusti facti ? ' with which cf. ' Gratia Dei, qua iustificamur, hoc est, iusti effecimur ' (*Retract.* ii, § 33 ; *Op.* i. 53 E [*P. L.* xxxii. 644]), and ' Iustitia Dei dicitur quod impertiendo eam, iustos facit ' (*De Sp. et litt.*, § 18). An error of interpretation was thus imported into St. Paul's theology, owing to Augustine's imperfect Greek, viz. that *δικαιοῦν* means to ' make righteous ' instead of to ' treat as righteous '. The Augustinian account of Justification got into mediaeval theology, and is now embodied in the Tridentine definition, ' Iustificatio ipsa . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis ', *Sess.* vi, c. vii. This is to confuse Justification (*Rom.* iii-v) and Sanctification (*Rom.* vi-viii) : they are distinct, though, on the conversion and baptism of an adult, the first is followed by the second.

¹³ *Ibid.*, §§ 5, 36, 41.

and rendered with joy and gratitude.¹ Yet the Law is not disparaged, nor free-will annulled. Nay, the one is fulfilled,² and the other is healed and so enabled to feel its freedom.³ Luther was right when he spoke of this treatise as inspired. It is : it touches the very heart of Christianity, as three men only have penetrated to it, St. Paul, St. Augustine, and Luther himself.

§ 6. We must leave the Pelagian controversy for a moment, to take a glance at a pamphlet of Augustine's, written early in 413, which throws an interesting light upon cross-currents of theological opinion and upon preparation for baptism at the time. Some laymen sent him a *brochure* which taught that eternal life could be won by faith, with baptism but without good works.⁴ Its authors observed that divorced persons, who had left wife or husband and married again, were not admitted to baptism. They ought to be admitted, on embracing the faith, without abandoning their sin. After baptism, let them be instructed in Christian morals, and urged to confession. But should they continue all their life in sin, provided only they kept the faith, 'they would be saved ; yet so as by fire'.⁵ In the *De fide et operibus*,⁶ Augustine dealt with these subversive opinions. He began, §§ 1-7, by protesting against indiscriminate baptism : we have to tolerate the wicked within the Church, but we must take care that they are not admitted when known to be such. Next, §§ 8-20, those who are preparing for Baptism must be taught not merely the faith but the morals of the Christian Church. Finally, §§ 21-6, those who are baptized must remember that faith alone, without good works, is not sufficient for salvation. So Augustine deals with the anticipations of opinions common in the sixteenth century, and now known as Solifidianism.⁷

§ 7. We return to the dangers attendant upon the opposite pole of religious thought ; for against them, at the request of archbishop Aurelius,⁸ Augustine warned his hearers at Carthage in a sermon⁹ of 25 June 413. Finding that the new opinions were spreading widely in Africa, and that the admirers of Caelestius were

¹ *De Sp. et litt.*, §§ 16, 18, 26, 42.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 6, 16, 21, 24.

³ *Ibid.*, § 52.

⁴ *Retract.* ii, § 38 (*Op.* i. 55 D ; *P. L.* xxxii. 646).

⁵ *De fide et operibus*, § 2 (*Op.* vi. 166 A ; *P. L.* xl. 198).

⁶ *Op.* vi. 165-92 (*P. L.* xl. 197-230) ; Fleury, xxiii. x ; Bardenhewer, 481.

⁷ They are in view in Art. xii, and for the name, see C. Hardwick, *Articles*, 126.

⁸ *De gest. Pel.*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 205 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 335).

⁹ *Sermo*, ccxciv (*Op.* vi. 1183-94 ; *P. L.* xxxviii. 1335-48) ; Fleury, xxiii. xiv.

retorting the charge of innovation and threatening their opponents with the censure of the Eastern churches, Augustine preached a controversial sermon. The new opinions, he began, § 1, are making rapid progress. The difference between us, § 2, is not whether infants ought to be baptized, but on what grounds they ought to be admitted to baptism. To say, §§ 3-4, that they need baptism not to attain eternal life but only to enter the kingdom, is a new and unheard-of doctrine : it is to set up a distinction where, in Scripture, no distinction exists. And, further, as Scripture mentions no 'middle place' between 'right' and 'left', between 'the kingdom' and 'fire eternal', to be shut out from the one is to be relegated to the other. 'An infant', therefore, § 7, 'dying unbaptized, goes into condemnation.' Such is the relentless severity of Augustine's logic. Not that he was wholly forgetful of the divine equity ; for, in an earlier work, he had called the fate of an unbaptized infant 'the mildest condemnation'¹ ; and, in a later, he held it to be so light that one could not say, 'Good were it for that child, if it had not been born'.² He does waver ; and, at times, is inconsistent with himself. But in this sermon his tones were harsh enough ; and he fell back on his favourite text, 'O the depth, &c.',³ for satisfaction. 'Scripture says so ; and I cannot help it'—so necessary, § 14, is baptism to salvation, in the case of all who are 'children of wrath'.⁴ And such, § 15, we were, because of our descent from Adam, 'in whom all have sinned'. If the Pelagians should take this to mean, as they do, only that Adam sinned first and we have sinned by following his example, surely it was the devil, not Adam, who set the first bad example ; and Abel, not Christ, who ought to have been our Saviour, for he set the first good one. If again, § 16, they ask, 'Why, if those who are born of a sinner, are sinners, are not those who are born of a believer righteous as he is ?'—Augustine answers, 'This is a cavil : the believer does not beget in that he is regenerate according to the Spirit, but in that he is begotten according to the flesh. Similar cavils are dismissed, with much more logic than they are worth. Augustine was the keenest of disputants ; and there are traces of

¹ *De pecc. merit.* i, § 21 (*Op.* x. 12 c ; *P. L.* xlv. 120). It was forgotten in the *Ten Articles* of 1536, 'and else not' (C. Hardwick, *Articles*, 243), but not by Hooker, *E. P.* v. lx, § 6, nor by our present rubric (the first at the end of *Public Baptism*), which omits 'and else not'.

² *Contra Iulianum*, v, § 44 (*Op.* x. 650 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 809).

³ Rom. xi. 33 : see § 7.

⁴ Eph. ii. 3.

eristic delight in this ex-professor of Rhetoric which, no doubt, popular audiences of the day appreciated ; and which are quite of a piece with the love of dialectics that characterized the Universities of antiquity as well as of the Middle Ages. Augustine, § 17, then reminds the people that, in allowing that infants are baptized because they are spiritually in need, the Pelagians have admitted too much ; and, § 19, he took out and read the celebrated passage from St. Cyprian where it was stated what the nature of that need is. ' If the greatest of sinners, when they turn to the faith, receive the remission of their sins and baptism ; how much less ought we to refuse it to an infant who is just born and hath not sinned, save only that, by being born of Adam according to the flesh, he has, by his first-birth, contracted the infection of the ancient death.'¹ To appeal to the authority of St. Cyprian at Carthage would be to leave the impression that there was nothing more to be said ; and the preacher created a great sensation. ' We will not call them heretics,' he concluded, § 20, ' though we might justly do so. Mistakes we can tolerate ; but not attacks on the very foundations of the Church.' Augustine more than carried out his own advice ; for, about this time, he received a letter from Pelagius and showed that he still hoped the best for him by replying in terms of respectful cordiality, and making no allusion to the opinions associated with his name.²

§ 8. Next year, 414, Hilary of Syracuse, a layman whom we have already mentioned, informed him that Christians there were maintaining (a) that a man can be without sin, (b) that he can easily keep the commandments of God, if he likes ; (c) that an infant, dying unbaptized, cannot justly perish, since he is born without sin ; (d) that riches are an absolute bar to salvation ; (e) that oaths are altogether wrong ; and (f) that ' the Church without spot or wrinkle'³ is that wherein we now are, so that it can be without sin.'⁴ Riches and oaths, it may be observed, were both things that might be dispensed with according to the Pelagians : so that men might the more easily be without sin. To these questions Augustine, as invited, replied in a letter⁵ of 414. As to (a) whether a man can live without sin, §§ 1-3, he will not go into the abstract

¹ Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiv, § 5 (*C. S. E. L.* III. ii. 720).

² *Ep.* cxlvi (*Op.* ii. 473 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 596) ; and *De gest. Pel.*, § 52 (*Op.* x. 218 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 349).

³ *Eph.* v. 27.

⁴ *Ep.* clvi (*Op.* ii. 542 ; *P. L.* xxxii. 674).

⁵ *Ep.* clvii (*Op.* ii. 542-59 ; *P. L.* xxxii. 674-93) ; Fleury, xxiii. xv.

question. Enough that no one ever has, or does. It is the answer of the second book of *De peccatorum meritis*. In regard to (b) that it is an easy thing, if we like, to keep the commandments, §§ 4-10, persons who think so may be put up with ; but it is an intolerable error to hold that 'freewill by itself is competent to fulfil the commandments of God'. It can only do so if it is assisted by Grace, as is clear from the Scriptures. In respect of (c) the baptism of infants, it is necessary, §§ 11-22, because infants are born in original sin ; incorporation into the Second Adam being indispensable because of our solidarity with the First. Upon the fourth question (d) whether rich men may be saved, §§ 25-39, he observes that there is a place for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom ; and proceeds to distinguish, by reference to the example of the rich young ruler,¹ between Counsels of Perfection that might require the abandonment of riches and the Precepts of the baptismal vow which run simply 'keep the commandments'. Coming to (e) oaths, § 40, they had better be avoided, as much as possible : not that it is wrong to swear truly, but it is a very great sin to swear falsely. And as to, §§ 39-40, (f) the purity of the Church, she endures in this world among her members not only imperfect Christians but sinners ; so that the Church on earth cannot be the 'Church without spot or wrinkle'.

§ 9. It is an interesting letter ; but far surpassed in interest—at least, to the churchmen of that day—by the news of the self-renunciation of Demetrias, which caused Jerome, Pelagius, and Augustine to shower their felicitations and advice upon her. Demetrias² was the daughter of Olybrius, Consul in 395. She had fled from Rome, on the approach of the Goths, and taken refuge at Carthage, accompanied by Juliana her mother and Proba her grandmother on her father's side. She was thus the heiress of the princely house whose head had been Proba's husband, Sextus Petronius Probus, 334-†94 : a man, as Ammianus tells us, who had estates in every region of the Empire, and felt like a fish out of water whenever he was not a Viceroy.³ Juliana and Proba had suffered much after landing in Africa, from the avarice of Count Heraclian⁴ ; and they resolved to marry Demetrias to some wealthy protector in exile, though they would have been better pleased to see her devoted to virginity. On the

¹ Mark x. 17-30.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 620-5 ; Fleury, xxiii. xii ; Newman, *Ch. F.*, c. xiv.

³ Amm. Marc. *Res Gestae*, xxvii. xi, §§ 1-3.

⁴ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx, § 7 (*Op.* i. 982 ; *P. L.* xxii. 1112).

eve of the wedding, Demetrias took them aback by declaring that this had long been her intention. They gave her dowry to the poor. And she received the veil from the hands of archbishop Aurelius. Her rank and prospects rendered her self-dedication famous. News of it spread far and wide, independently of the care which Proba and Juliana took to acquaint Augustine¹ and Jerome² with the event. Hence quite a literature : of which we have two specimens from Palestine, from Jerome and Pelagius, besides a note of warning, in respect of the latter, from Augustine himself.

(1) Jerome, now in his seventy-third year, sent Demetrias a letter³ to congratulate and encourage her. It is difficult to do him justice, because of his excitable temperament. The news seems to have carried him off his feet ; and, in apostrophes to Demetrias, he exhausts the extravagances of language in describing what she had done. Every church in Africa, he says, §§ 1-6, ' danced for joy at the tidings. Every island between Italy and Africa was full of it. . . . Italy put off her mourning, and the ruined walls of Rome resumed in part their olden splendour. . . . You would fancy that the Goths had been annihilated.' After this outburst, Jerome goes on to, § 7, praise the virtues and charities of Proba, specially for having ' aided with her goodwill the desire which Demetrias had formed ', and then ' to direct all his words to Demetrias herself '. He recommends her to occupy her mind ' with the reading of Scripture ' ; §§ 8-9, to guard her thoughts ; § 10, to practise fasting, but, § 11, not to excess for, as the philosophers tell us, ' virtues are means and all extremes are of the nature of vice ' and ' fasting is not a complete virtue in itself but only a foundation on which others may be built ' ; §§ 12-13, to be careful about company and conversation ; § 14, to be judicious in almsgiving, but not to spend money on the building and adornment of churches—advice which should rank Jerome with the Cistercians and with others, often spoken of as the most hierarchical persons, who were almost puritan in church-appointments. All this, says Jerome, is advice ' for one who is a Virgin, but also a lady of wealth and rank. Now for, § 15, what concerns the Virgin herself. Be methodical, both in devotion and study ; do a little weaving. Avoid, § 16, Origenism ! Not too much, § 17, solitude ! but keep clear, § 18, of married

¹ Aug. *Ep.* cl (*Op.* ii. 516 sq. ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 645)

² Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx. § 1 (*Op.* i. 976 sq. ; *P. L.* xxii. 1107).

³ *Ep.* cxxx (*Op.* i. 976-97 ; *P. L.* xxii. 1107-24).

women and of "gay and giddy girls who deck their heads, and wear their hair in fringes, who use cosmetics to improve their skin, and go in for tight sleeves, gowns without a crease and dainty shoes." Better make a friend of a girl who is unconscious of her good looks ; and does not, when she goes out, throw back her cloak to show her neck and bust. As for, § 19, young men who "curl their hair and scent themselves with musk", I will only say of them, in the words of the poet, "Too much savour is an ill-savour."¹

After all, the letter, though unmistakably Jerome's, is one of his best, most moderate and most judicious. Newman speaks of the advice it gave to Demetrias as 'sage and sobering'.² And rightly. Demetrias was in danger of Pelagianism ; for she had been made so much of—by rich but good women, and by distinguished ecclesiastics³—as to be in danger of spiritual pride.

(2) As if by instinct, Pelagius also wrote to Demetrias,⁴ 414. 'I write', he says, § 1, 'at the wish of your mother ; and, § 2, as is my custom when giving instruction about holiness of life, I would begin by drawing your attention to the strength of human nature. The way to encourage people to aim at perfection is to make them hopeful of acquiring it. Now, § 3, the dignity of our nature consists chiefly in free-will. God has made us by nature equally capable of good or of evil ; and we may turn our will as easily to the one as to the other. Wise men among the heathen have used their powers for good, from sheer goodness of nature. "If then, men without God have shown what sort of a nature God gave them, consider what is open to Christians whose nature and life have been trained to better things, and who are even assisted by the aid of divine grace." The capacities of nature, § 4, are clear from the testimony of conscience : for conscience sits enthroned in the citadel of the soul, and distributes praise or blame as we do well or ill. Numbers, § 5, have lived, under that law only, saintly lives : as, § 6, Abel, Joseph, Job : the last, in particular, having shown us the hidden riches of nature and how, what he did, all can do. You are, § 7, a diligent reader of Scripture, Demetrias, and you know how it is full of instances bearing out the strength of the will ;

¹ Martial, *Epigrammaton*, II xii. 4.

² Newman, *Ch. F.*² 271.

³ Including Pope Innocent I, *Ep.* xv (*P. L.* xx. 518 sq.) ; Jaffé, No. 302.

⁴ His letter is given in Aug. *Op.* ii, app. 5-18 (*P. L.* xxxiii. 1099-1120) and in Jerome, *Op.* xi (*P. L.* xxx. 13-45). Aug. alludes to it in *De grat. Chr.* §§ 23, 40 (*Op.* x. 240 b ; *P. L.* xlv. 371, 8) : see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 631 sq. ; Fleury, xxiii. xiii ; Newman, *Ch. F.*² 273.

so that, § 8, sin must be ascribed to the will alone, and not to any fault of nature. Adam was ejected and Enoch translated, the latter no less than the former, owing to the use he made of his freedom of will ; and, if it be asked, How then do we all find it so hard to do right ? the answer is that the difficulty is entirely one of habit. We have each got so accustomed to sin that with each of us sin has become second nature. But, if there have been saints before the Law and the coming of the Saviour, a higher perfection is open to us who have been furnished with His grace, cleansed by His blood, and incited to holiness by His example.' Pelagius then passes on, §§ 9-10, from general principles to precepts specially meant for the guidance of Demetrias. He recommends Bible-reading and prayer. But he recurs, before long, to his favourite theme that, § 11, all turns upon a good will : and then tells her that whereas rank and wealth come from her parents, she alone can bestow on herself the true riches. The letter now becomes more discursive, and begins to repeat itself. If God's commandments are difficult, no one knows better the measure of our strength than He who gave it us. Slackness,¹ § 16, is the real trouble ; but we forget that God is too just to command what is impossible, and too good to condemn what we cannot help. If, § 17, sinful habit has smothered the goodness of nature, the remedy is to be found in penitence and a change of will. We may even, § 25, merit God's grace, and so easily resist the devil by the help of the Holy Spirit. The Catholic doctrine of 'merita' is that they are 'munera'² ; but much of the letter is excellent—if we could only forget that Pelagius wrote it. But there crops up, every now and then, the author's unbalanced belief in 'the power and perfectibility'³ of unaided human nature ; his spiritual pride ; and the tendency of his system to 'dull the sense of sin'⁴ by allowing God to be thought of as a good-natured Being and so lowering the standard of the divine requirement. Its main fault lies in what it leaves out. Thus, it mentions grace ; but is defective both as to its nature and its need, and as to our insufficiency apart from it. Something

¹ Document No. 127 ; and for ἀκηδία, or sloth considered as indifference, see St. Thos. Aq. *Summa*, II. i. 84 *ad* 4, and F. Paget, *The Spirit of Discipline*, 1-50.

² Aug. *Ep.* xciv, § 19 (*Op.* ii. 720 G ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 880) ; and W. Bright, *St. Leo*², 189.

³ J. B. Mozley, *Lectures, &c.*, No. xi, on the Pelagian doctrine of perfectibility.

⁴ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 104.

of this sort was the impression left on Augustine by the letter. When first it came into his hands, he tells us that it nearly converted him to the belief that Pelagius was coming round. But, on further consideration, he saw that grace, on his lips, was a term of 'ambiguous generalities'.¹

(3) It was, in the main, against one point in the letter to her daughter that, in co-operation with Alypius, Augustine sent a letter of warning to Juliana,² 417-18. Demetrias is not to think, as Pelagius had suggested, that her spiritual riches are her own work.³

Two more anti-Pelagian treatises—the third and the fourth in the series—left his hands before the controversy travelled, for an interval, to the East.

§ 10. The third was entitled *De natura et gratia*⁴; and was written early in 415, in reply to the *De natura* of Pelagius. Timasius and James, two young men of birth and education, had been induced by Pelagius to give up secular prospects for an ascetic life; and also to embrace his theory. They were, however, profoundly impressed by Augustine's arguments in favour of Christian Grace; and they sent him the *De natura*, with a request that he would supply them with an answer to it.⁵ As may be guessed from its title, the object of the author was to demonstrate the sufficiency of human nature for good.⁶ 'It was possible', he contended, 'to live without sin' by the grace or aid of God; but 'he illustrated this position by a reference to natural faculties, and spoke of a capacity of not sinning which nature, as endowed with free-will, had received from God.'⁷ Either sin was avoidable, or else it was something for which we were not responsible; and not being a 'substance', it could not vitiate our nature as such.⁸ Supposing, however, that a man had not escaped sin? What then? In that case, of course, he stood in need of divine help, by way of

¹ *De grat. Chr.*, § 40 (*Op.* x. 246 F; *P. L.* xliv. 379).

² *Ep.* clxxxviii (*Op.* ii. 692-7; *P. L.* xxxiii. 848-54).

³ *Ibid.*, § 5.

⁴ *Op.* x. 127-64 (*P. L.* xliv. 247-90); Fleury, xxiii. xv.

⁵ *Aug. Epp.* clxxvii, § 6 (*Op.* ii. 624; *P. L.* xxxiii. 767); clxxviii (*Op.* ii. 602 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 741 sq.), quoted in *De gest. Pel.*, § 48 (*Op.* x. 217; *P. L.* xliv. 347 sq.); and clxxix, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 630; *P. L.* xxxiii. 774).

⁶ *De nat. et grat.*, §§ 1, 7 (*Op.* x. 127, 130; *P. L.* xliv. 247, 250).

⁷ W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xxii; cf. *De nat. et grat.*, §§ 12, 53 (*Op.* x. 132, 149; *P. L.* xliv. 252 sq., 272 sq.).

⁸ *De nat. et grat.*, § 21 (*Op.* x. 135 c; *P. L.* xliv. 256). For this theory, that evil is 'simply a privation of good', see *Aug. Conf.* iii, § 12, vii, § 18 (*Op.* i. 92 E, 140; *P. L.* xxxii. 688, 743); and *De perf. iust.*, § 4 (*Op.* x. 169 A; *P. L.* xliv. 294); *Ath. De Inc.* iv, § 5; Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 271.

exceptional intervention, as when a doctor is called in to dress a wound.¹ Such intervention consisted in forgiveness.² 'Of real grace, as a supernatural preservative against sin, there was no recognition throughout the treatise.'³ But there was much 'vindication of nature', as if the goodness of the original creation was impeached by the tenet of a subsequent corruption⁴; much affirmation of human sinlessness⁵; and much appeal to Catholic writers—Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine himself—in support of the Christian's power over sin.⁶ Augustine meets these assertions one by one; and follows up other positions that arise out of them, e.g. the characteristic incapacity of Pelagius to admit that one sin may involve penal abandonment to another.⁷ But the general drift of the *De natura et gratia* is, as its title suggests, to show that Grace is not contrary to Nature; but that Nature, being corrupted and weakened by sin, has need of being 'delivered and governed by Grace'.⁸ We need not pursue the analysis of the treatise in detail; yet some of its *obiter dicta* are worth notice:

(1) Augustine bears testimony to Pelagius, not only to his character⁹ and abilities,¹⁰ but also to his motives: for, if he exaggerates free-will, he does so for the glory of the God of nature, and Pelagius, therefore, has the best of intentions. He even gives an equivocal sense to Grace—so much so that Augustine thought, on first reading, that his opponent was coming round; but, as he read on in the *De natura*, he found that by Grace Pelagius only meant natural endowment, and is afraid that he used the term disingenuously.¹¹

(2) He denies salvation to all who are unbaptized.¹² In judging Augustine's theology, we have constantly to bear in mind how strongly it is coloured by his logic and by his personal experience.

(3) He condemns the Pelagian theory as inadequate. It reduced

¹ *De nat. et grat.*, § 29 (*Op.* x. 139 f; *P. L.* xliv. 261).

² *Ibid.*, § 20 (*Op.* x. 135; *P. L.* xliv. 256).

³ *Ibid.*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 138 d; *P. L.* xliv. 259).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 59 (*Op.* x. 152; *P. L.* xliv. 275 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 42 (*Op.* x. 144; *P. L.* xliv. 267).

⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 71 sqq. (*Op.* x. 158 sqq.; *P. L.* xliv. 282 sqq.).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 24 (*Op.* x. 137; *P. L.* xliv. 258).

⁸ *Retract.* ii, § 42 (*Op.* i. 56 d; *P. L.* xxxii. 647).

⁹ *De nat. et grat.*, §§ 1, 7 (*Op.* x. 127 A, 130 c; *P. L.* xliv. 247, 250).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 6 (*Op.* x. 130 B; *P. L.* xliv. 250).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 12 (*Op.* x. 132; *P. L.* xliv. 252 sq.).

¹² *Ibid.*, § 9 (*Op.* x. 131; *P. L.* xliv. 251).

the office of Christ to the rôle of an instructor¹; or, at any rate, it left Him no more than the meritorious cause of pardon.² But neither of these functions is enough; nor the two together. The Saviour must also be acknowledged as nothing less than the recreative and life-imparting Christ of the Gospel; the Source of Grace, prevenient and co-operative³; the spiritual Restorer of the human race.⁴ Catholic Christianity is to Augustine what it was to Athanasius; and the Saviour is not only Example or Teacher, and Redeemer, but Restorer as well.⁵

(4) He uses the words commonly quoted in favour of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady. 'I put aside', he says, 'the Holy Virgin Mary: for, in honour of our Lord, I would rather she were not brought into the discussion, when we are talking about sin.' But note the context. He is dealing with the Pelagian argument, drawn from a long succession of Old Testament saints, in favour of the conclusion that numbers have lived without sin: 'men from Abel to John' and 'women from Deborah to the mother of our Lord and Saviour herself, whom piety requires us to acknowledge as without sin'. Then he continues: 'I would rather her name were not brought into the discussion; for how are we to know how much additional grace, for the entire conquest of sin, was bestowed upon her whose privilege it was to conceive and give birth to Him who had no sin?'⁶ Not only is the passage not *ad rem* for the support of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. It positively excludes it.

§ 11. The year in which the *De natura et gratia* was dispatched, in answer to Pelagius, had not closed before Augustine had sent off, in reply to Caelestius, the fourth anti-Pelagian treatise entitled *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*,⁷ about the end of 415. It was addressed to Eutropius and Paul, two refugee bishops from Spain who had sent him a paper, brought by some churchmen from Sicily, and containing a series of questions so framed as to reduce the anti-Pelagian position, about sin and sinlessness, *ad absurdum*.

¹ *De nat. et grat.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 136 E; *P. L.* xliv. 257 sq.).

² J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 101.

³ *De nat. et grat.*, § 35 (*Op.* x. 142 c; *P. L.* xliv. 264).

⁴ *Ibid.*, §§ 39, 50, 60, 62 (*Op.* x. 143 sq., 148, 152, and esp. 153 F; *P. L.* xliv. 266, 271, 276 sq.).

⁵ *Ath. De Inc.* viii, § 4, x, § 1 (*Op.* i. 42, 44; *P. G.* xxvi. 109 c, d, 112 sq.).

⁶ *De nat. et grat.*, § 42 (*Op.* x. 144 sq.; *P. L.* xliv. 267).

⁷ *Op.* x. 167-190 (*P. L.* xliv. 291-318); W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xxiv sq. 118-49.

Augustine had no doubt that these *Definitiones*, or arguments in the form of dilemma, were the work of Caelestius.¹ They smack of the smart barrister. 'First of all,' runs the first, 'I should like to ask the person who says that one cannot live without sin, What is sin? Something that can be avoided, or something that cannot? If it cannot be avoided, then it is not sin. If it can, then a man can be without sin.' Sixteen of such 'captious interrogatories' and their refutation occupy §§ 1-16. 'They all tend to one point, that men can live entirely without sin: and that there is no tenable ground between this position and the denial of all responsibility or, in other words, of the reality of sin.'² Augustine then examines, §§ 7-43, the array of *testimonia* or texts which Caelestius found quoted against his thesis or himself alleged in its favour; and he concludes, § 44, by declining to censure, though he will not defend, the theory of sinlessness. The treatise was thus clearly written before the Council of Carthage, 1 May 418, by whom the theory was condemned.³

§ 12. So ended the earlier series of writings with which Augustine intervened in the matter of Pelagianism, when there arrived at Hippo a youth who was to be the means of transferring the controversy, temporarily, to the East. His name was Paulus Orosius, *fl.* 414-18. On Michaelmas Eve, 409, the Vandals, Alans, and Sueves had entered Spain.⁴ A few years later they were succeeded by the Arian Visigoths⁷; and before these fled the Catholic clergy, among whom was Orosius. He was born at Bracara in Gallaecia, now Braga in Portugal. In the barbarian invasions he narrowly escaped with his life; and came to Hippo, 414, for he wished to consult Augustine about Priscillianist and Origenist opinions, now flooding his native country. He thinks them a worse disaster than its bloodthirsty foes.⁶ In his *Consultatio*,⁷ 414, addressed to Augustine, he puts first the errors of Priscillian, § 2, who said, with the Manichees, that the soul was part of the Divine substance conveyed into the body to be punished according to

¹ *De perf. just. hom.*, c.i. (*Op.* x. 167 B; *P. L.* xlv. 293).

² W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xxv.

³ *Conc. Carth.*, A. D. 418, cc. 7-9; Aug. *Op.* x, app. ii. 107 (*P. L.* xlv. 1729).

⁴ Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 40 (*Op.* 578; *P. L.* xxxi. 1167); Hodgkin, i. ii. 824.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 43 (*Op.* 584; *P. L.* xxxi. 1171 sq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 836.

⁶ Orosius, *Consultatio*, § 1 (*P. L.* xxxi. 1213 A); Aug. *Ep.* clxvi, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 583 a; *P. L.* xxxiii. 721).

⁷ *P. L.* xxxi. 1211-16; Aug. *Op.* viii. 607-10 (*P. L.* xlii. 665-70); *C. S. E. L.* xviii. 151-7; Fleury, xxiii. xvi.

its deserts, and used Sabellianizing language in respect of the Trinity. Then he goes on to say, § 3, how Avitus, one of his fellow-countrymen, went to Jerusalem, to avoid the confusion in which he was getting involved by the maintenance of these errors, only to return with the doctrine of Origen. Some of it, as on the Trinity, was a corrective of Priscillianism ; but it had errors of its own, e.g. that angels, devils, and souls were of one substance but had received these different ranks according to their merit ; that the eternal fire was not fire but remorse of conscience, and only eternal in the sense of lasting indefinitely, so that all souls, and the devil himself, would ultimately be saved. 'Remember me then,' § 4, concludes Orosius, 'most blessed father ; and the many like me who wait upon your word, that it may drop upon them as the dew.'

Augustine was pleased with Orosius, whom he describes to Jerome as 'a religious young man, in age my son, in rank my fellow-presbyter, of a lively wit, a ready tongue, and an ardent desire for knowledge'.¹ He replied to him in his *Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*,² 415. In regard to, § 1, Priscillianism, he refers him to his anti-Manichaean writings ; but, §§ 2-3, the soul is no part of the Divine substance. It is created out of nothing, as are the rest of God's works. As to, §§ 5-6, Origen's universalism, not only the 'fire' but the 'life' is called 'eternal'. The world, § 9, was not made to punish spirits, but by the goodness of God. Whether, § 11, the stars are animated, I cannot say. I believe that there is a celestial hierarchy—thrones, dominions, principedoms, powers—but 'that you may despise me whom you think so great a doctor, I confess I know neither what they are nor wherein they differ'. He ends, § 14, by warning his eager young correspondent against trying to know more than is revealed.

One of the questions, however, which Orosius had raised, had already come before Augustine's notice, 412. Jerome had been consulted by Marcellinus on the question of the origin of souls. Is each man's soul created along with his body ? Or does he owe it, as he owes his body, to his parents ? Does Creationism or Traducianism offer the best account of the origin of the soul ? 'I remember your little problem,' writes Jerome to Marcellinus and his wife Anapsychia ; 'but, as you are in Africa, why not ask the bishop Augustine ? He is both learned and holy ; and will give

¹ Aug. *Ep.* clxvi, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 583 a ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 720 sq.).

² *Op.* viii. 611-20 (*P. L.* xlii. 669-78).

you his opinion—or, rather, mine—by word of mouth.’¹ But Augustine was as perplexed with the question as Jerome himself. So making an emissary of the insatiable Orosius, who had revived the topic, Augustine sent him to Palestine as bearer of two important letters to Jerome ; the one, on the origin of the soul ; the other, on the question of the equality of sins—both of the spring of 415.

In the former, or *Liber de origine animae hominis*,² Augustine, after, §§ 1, 2, introducing Orosius, takes it for granted that the soul is, § 3, immortal, not part of the Godhead, § 4, incorporeal, and that, § 5, it has fallen into sin of its own will. ‘What I want to know’, he continues, § 6, ‘is, Where it contracted that guilt which is the cause of the condemnation even of an infant dying unbaptized? In my book, § 7, *De libero arbitrio*, which I wrote against the Manichees, I stated four opinions on the origin of the soul ; that all souls are derived from that of the first man : that new souls are made daily for this or that individual : that, if souls pre-exist, either God sends them into bodies, or they enter into bodies of themselves. I see, § 8, from your letter to Marcellinus that the second opinion is yours, viz. that God makes a soul for every man as he is born. I wish it were mine ; but I find difficulty in adopting it.’³ The difficulties arise, of course, in connexion with Original

¹ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxi, § 1 (*Op.* 948 sq. ; *P. L.* xxii. 1085). Jerome held the ordinary Eastern view, viz. Creationism, supporting his position by such texts as Ps. xxxiii. 15 ; Zech. xii. 1 ; John v. 17, &c., as in his *Contra Ioann. Hierosol.*, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 427 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 375 A). This view was held by Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* x, § 20 (*Op.* ii. 334 ; *P. L.* x. 358 A), and *Tract. in Ps.* xci, § 3 (*Op.* i. 266 ; *P. L.* ix. 495 c), and has become the dominant view in Christendom : see the six views given in Fleury, xxiii. xvii (ii. 248, note f). On the question between Creationism and Traducianism, see K. R. Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrine*, § 106 ; H. Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 74 ; R. I. Wilberforce, *The Incarnation*, 29 ; H. P. Liddon, *Some elements of Religion*, 92 sqq. ; A. L. Moore, *Essays*, 75 sqq. ; F. R. Tennant, *Sources*, &c., 329 sqq. ; J. B.-Baker, *Chr. Doctrine*, 302 ; J. Wilhelm and T. B. Scannell, *Manual of [Roman] Catholic Theology*⁴, i. 206-10.

² Aug. *Ep.* clxvi (*Op.* ii. 583-94 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 720-33) ; Fleury, xxiii. xvii.

³ Aug. thought that Creationism was inconsistent with the transmission of sinful propensity, as he says in his treatise against the Creationist, Vincentius Victor [c. 419-20], *De anima et origine eius*, i, § 10 (*Op.* x. 342 B ; *P. L.* xlv. 500 sq.) ; but he never felt certain about the question (*Retract.* i. i, § 3 [*Op.* i. 4 sq. ; *P. L.* xxxii. 587]), and was never a convinced advocate of the Western view, viz. Traducianism, which is found in Tert. *De anima*, §§ 19, 27, and has for its biblical basis, Gen. v. 3 ; Ps. li. 5 ; Rom. v. 12-19 ; 1 Cor. xv. 22 ; Eph. ii. 3 ; Hebr. vii. 10. It was held by Gregory of Nyssa, *De anima et resurrectione* (*Op.* iii. 241 A ; *P. G.* xlv. 1250) ; whereas the Eastern view was held by Lactantius, *De opificio Dei*, § 19 (*Op.* ii ; *P. L.* vii. 75 sq.).

Sin and the punishment of infants dying unbaptized. Their lot seems wholly unjust, § 25, if they are entirely new souls created on purpose for each body : yet condemned they must be, if the voice of Scripture and of the Church is to mean anything. As to those, § 27, who think to get themselves out of this difficulty by supposing that souls pre-existed and are appointed to different bodies, according to their deserts in a former life, that is an opinion which I cannot believe. It is one thing to sin *in* Adam ; but quite another to sin, no one knows where, *extra* Adam and, for so sinning, to be shut up *in* Adam, i.e. in a body born of Adam's kin, as in a prison. Pray God, § 27, help me out of my ignorance by your means ; and, if not, give me grace to be content not to know.'

The second letter, entitled *De sententia Iacobi*,¹ sc. that 'he who shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all',² discusses the question of the relation of sins to each other. If you admit, as St. James seems to say, that, § 4, the virtues are inseparable, are you not bound to the conclusion that all sins are equal ? This was the Stoic opinion. Jerome had denied it, in the case of Jovinian. But the Pelagians, with their affinities to Stoicism, had adopted it. The opinion made light of the difference between heinous and trifling sins ; and so it favoured their tenet of there having been men altogether without sin. But one vice, as Augustine points out, § 9, is often destructive of another. Sins, therefore, cannot be equal. And all that St. James appears to mean is that every sin is an offence, § 16, against the one principle of love, which alone is the fulfilling of the law. But, on this point also, Augustine is ready to defer to Jerome's opinion.

¹ *Ep.* clxvii (*Op.* ii. 594-602 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 733-41) ; Fleury, xxiii. xvii.

² James ii. 10.

CHAPTER VI

PELAGIANISM (iii), 415-18, IN PALESTINE, AFRICA, ROME

WITH these important letters,¹ and with a copy of the letter to Hilary,² all three bearing on the points at issue with Pelagius, Orosius set sail from Carthage; and, about midsummer 415, arrived in Palestine.

§ 1. Here he found Jerome, for all his weight of years, already in controversy with Pelagianism. For Pelagius had preceded him, and had been marked down by Jerome almost from his landing in the country. He was Rufinus resurrected! He was a Latin ecclesiastic, moreover, influential with John, still bishop of Jerusalem, 386-†417; and, what is more, influential with great ladies of the Roman aristocracy—had he not been writing to Demetrias?—whom Jerome looked upon as his especial preserve.

(1) In answer, therefore, to an inquirer named Ctesiphon,³ Jerome had begun, 415, to attack the Pelagian theory of human sinlessness. He traced, § 1, the new opinions to the Pythagoreans and Stoics; insisted, § 3, that, according to Scripture, no man had ever lived 'without sin'; accused, § 5, the Pelagians of trifling with the word 'grace', as if it meant simply free-will and the moral law; denounced, §§ 5-8, the thorny syllogisms or *Definitiones* of Caelestius, to which, it will be remembered, Augustine had replied in his *De perfectione iustitiae*; repelled, § 9, the imputation of Manichaeism, so freely made by the Pelagians against their opponents; and declared, § 10, that to assert the Fall and the need of real Grace was not to call nature evil nor to deny free-will in man. He ends, § 13, by promising to return to the question on a larger scale.

(2) Old as he was, he lived to fulfil his promise in the *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*,⁴ 415. It was the last of his controversial

¹ *Epp.* clxvi, clxvii.

² *Ep.* clvii.

³ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxxiii (*Op.* i. 1025-42; *P. L.* xxii. 1147-61); Fleury, xxiii. xviii; Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 328 sq.

⁴ *Op.* ii. 693-806 (*P. L.* xxiii. 495-590); Tillemont *Mém.* xii 330 sqq.; Fleury, xxiii. xviii.

works, wanting none of the old vigour; and it acquired such a reputation for literary finish that even the Pelagians acknowledged its distinction.¹ To avoid persons and keep only to opinions, says Jerome in the prologue, I will call myself Atticus and my opponent Critobulus.² 'I hear then', says Atticus, § 1, at the opening of Book I, 'that you affirm, Critobulus, that men can live without sin.' 'I do affirm it; but I do not go on to say, as is imputed to us, "without the grace of God". Free-will is part of His grace.' 'That is just the point,' § 2, replies Atticus, 'What do you mean by grace? Is grace only our original nature, or is it needed in every act?' 'In every act,' admits Critobulus: 'yet one would hardly say, § 3, one cannot mend a pen without grace; else what becomes of our free-will?' 'But, § 5, according to Scripture, we need God's aid in everything,' says Atticus. 'If so,' § 6, is the reply, 'the promised reward is due not to me, but to Him who wrought in me.' 'But to revert', §§ 7, 8, continues Atticus, 'to the point from which we started—as to the possibility of sinlessness. We will to be sinless: why then are we not actually sinless?' 'Because', answers Critobulus, 'we do not exert our will to the full.' 'But no one, § 9, has ever lived without sin.' 'I am talking about possibilities,' §§ 10, 11, says the Pelagian, 'God commands us to be perfect, and He does not command what is impossible. Job, Zacharias, and Elizabeth, § 12, for instance, are described as perfect.' But Atticus will not admit it; 'faults are attributed to each of them'; and so the discussion proceeds, § 13, to the stock texts of Pelagianism: 'Whosoever is born of God sinneth not' [1 *John* iii. 9], which Atticus counters with 'If we say that we have no sin,' &c. [1 *John* i. 8]. 'Be ye perfect, § 14, as your heavenly Father is perfect' [*Matt.* v. 48, cf. *Deut.* xviii. 13], and, § 24, 'Now unto Him that is able to keep you without sin,' &c. [*Jude* 24]. Then follows, §§ 25 sqq., a criticism of the *Capitula*³ of Pelagius: where, however, it should be remembered that we have no means of getting at their context and are dependent solely on Jerome's quotation of them, for such extracts, § 27, as that 'All men are ruled by their own will,' or that, § 31, 'The kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament.' The *Dialogue* then returns, §§ 32 sqq., to the

¹ Aug. *Op. imp. c. Iul.* iv, § 88 (*Op.* x. 1181 f; *P. L.* xlv. 1389).

² *Dial. adv. Pel.*, Prol., § 2 (*Op.* ii. 695 sq.; *P. L.* xxiii. 498).

³ Sometimes called *Testimoniorum Liber*.

original thesis 'that a man can be without sin, and easily keep the commandments of God if he chooses': and Books II and III contain an elaborate refutation of it from Scripture—tedious, indeed, but final. He ends by referring Critobulus to Augustine, and averring that Pelagianism is due to Origenism.¹ So far for the general outline of the *Dialogue*: there are one or two details of interest. He alludes to Apollinarianism. 'Some do not dare to confess the complete manhood of Christ, lest they should be compelled to accept the belief that He had the sins of a man.'² The answer, of course, is that sin is not necessary to complete manhood. He, at last, takes *Gal.* ii. 11–14 reasonably; and abandons the theory that St. Peter and St. Paul were playing a part.³ 'Christians,' he says, 'if they have been overtaken by sin, must be saved after they have been punished'⁴: a passage interpreted of a purgatory between death and judgement. As to Christian worship, white vestments are mentioned as in use by the clergy⁵; and the Eucharist is spoken of as 'the sacrifice of His Body'.⁶ He observes that, *John* vii. 53–viii. 11, the story of the woman taken in adultery is 'found in many *codices* both Greek and Latin'.⁷ And when he says that 'so much as this depends upon our free-will, viz. that we will, desire and give assent to the course we choose',⁸ he has been held to assign the *initiation* of good to man's free-will, or, in other words, to incline towards semi-Pelagianism, the system largely provoked by exaggerations for which Augustine was himself responsible.

§ 2. So Jerome was occupied when Orosius, after his arrival in Palestine, came, as he says, 'to sit at his feet'⁹: and Orosius was presently invited by John,¹⁰ bishop of Jerusalem 386–†417, to attend the Diocesan Synod of Jerusalem,¹¹ 28 July 415. When the Synod met, Orosius was allowed a seat with the presbyters: and on being asked what he knew of the events of the controversy

¹ *Dial. adv. Pel.* iii, § 19 (*Op.* ii. 804 sqq.; *P. L.* xxiii. 588 sqq.).

² *Ibid.* i, § 20 (*Op.* ii. 716; *P. L.* xxiii. 514 A).

³ *Ibid.* i, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 718; *P. L.* xxiii. 516 A).

⁴ *Ibid.* i, § 28 (*Op.* ii. 726; *P. L.* xxiii. 522 c, and note e).

⁵ *Ibid.* i, § 29 (*Op.* ii. 727; *P. L.* xxiii. 524 A).

⁶ *Ibid.* iii, § 15 (*Op.* ii. 800; *P. L.* xxiii. 585 A).

⁷ *Ibid.* ii, § 17 (*Op.* ii. 762; *P. L.* xxiii. 583).

⁸ *Ibid.* iii, § 10 (*Op.* ii. 793; *P. L.* xxiii. 793 c, and note b).

⁹ Orosius, *Apol.*, § 3 (*Op.* 590; *P. L.* xxxi. 1176 B).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* 590; *P. L.* xxxi. 1176 c).

¹¹ The authority for this Synod is Orosius, *Apol.* or *De arb. lib.*, §§ 1–6 (*Op.* 588–93; *P. L.* xxxi. 1173–8), or *C. S. E. L.* v. 603–11; Mansi, iv. 307 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, ii. i. 176 sq. (*E. Tr.* ii. 449 sq.); Fleury, xxiii. xix.

he told his story. Prompted, no doubt, by Jerome and by his own desire to upset the influence of Pelagius in the East, he told them of the condemnation of Caelestius at Carthage, 411-12, and how Augustine, in the *De natura et gratia* had replied to Timasius and James against the *De natura* of Pelagius; and read to the assembly his letter to the Sicilian Hilary. Whereupon, at the bishop's request, Pelagius was shown in. 'Do you hold', he was asked, 'the opinions to which Augustine has replied?' 'What has Augustine to do with me?' he answered. Orosius expected John of Jerusalem simply to be the registrar of the decisions of Carthage and of Augustine's opinions. But to undeceive him, and, at the same time, to quell the outcry raised by the insult to Augustine, the bishop bade Pelagius, though a layman, to take his seat, like Orosius, among his clergy, remarking, 'I am Augustine here'. 'If you represent Augustine', broke in Orosius and his friends, 'give us the sentiments of Augustine.' Ignoring this challenge, John simply asked Orosius whether what had been read was to be taken as referring to Pelagius; and, if so, to state his charge. 'Pelagius has told me that he taught that a man could be without sin, and easily keep the commandments of God, if he chose. Is that your teaching?' asked John, turning to the burly¹ defendant. 'It is.' 'Well then,' interposed Orosius, 'this is just what the Council of Carthage, Augustine, and Jerome himself in his letter to Ctesiphon and in the *Dialogue* he is now engaged upon, are agreed in condemning!'² Orosius evidently imagined that John would allow that to settle the matter. But the bishop did not take that view; and asked if Orosius, with Posserius and Avitus his fellow-presbyters, would enter a formal indictment against Pelagius. They declined: and Orosius, who was a person with more zeal than tact, made the fatal mistake of replying that he had simply come to inform John of the sentence of the African episcopate.³ But the Africans had only condemned Caelestius; and, even if they had condemned Pelagius as well, their decision could not bind or compromise an independent Church. John, therefore, stuck to his point, and requested Pelagius to explain himself on the question of sinlessness. 'I did

¹ For the personal appearance of Pelagius, see Orosius, *Apol.*, §§ 16, 31 (*Op.* 602, 621; *P. L.* xxxi. 1185, 1200 B); and Jerome, *Dial. adv. Pel.* i, § 28 (*Op.* ii. 726; *P. L.* xxiii. 522 B).

² Orosius, *Apol.*, § 4 (*Op.* 591; *P. L.* xxxi. 1177 B).

³ *Ibid.*, § 5 (*Op.* 591 sq.; *P. L.* xxxi. 1177 C).

not say', was his answer, 'that human nature has received the capacity of sinlessness: what I said was that, if a man will strive and wrestle for his own salvation so as to avoid sin and to walk in the commandments of God, he has this possibility from God¹: and without the grace of God it is impossible to become perfect.'² This apparently liberal concession to his opponents on the part of Pelagius, Orosius leaves out. We have it on the authority of Augustine. Thereupon the bishop turned to Orosius and asked whether the admission was not, after all, satisfactory.—'Do you deny the efficacy of God's help?' 'Certainly not,' said Orosius. But John spoke in Greek and Orosius in Latin, and the interpreter had been caught tripping. Orosius, therefore, beginning to feel out of his depth, suggested that the question was of Latin origin. 'Let it be referred to Pope Innocent.' It was a happy suggestion; the synod agreed³; perhaps others, too, were conscious of their being able to get no further. And they broke up at once, without having taken any minutes.⁴ Six or seven weeks later, on 13 September 415, came the Feast of the Dedication of the Church of the Resurrection, and Orosius went to pay his respects to the bishop. John unexpectedly denounced him as having blasphemously said that 'not even with the help of God is it possible for a man to live without sin'. 'I never said so,' retorted Orosius⁵: and to clear himself he wrote, probably with the aid of Jerome, his *Liber apologeticus de arbitrii libertate*, 415, our main authority for the events of the synod just narrated. It was addressed to 'the priests'⁶ of Jerusalem, and consisted chiefly of an attack on Pelagius. Orosius, for instance, unfairly accuses him of saying that he himself was without spot of sin⁷; and is needlessly emphatic about Pelagius' personal appearance.⁸ Yet the Apology is important, and gives much information. One result of the collision which prompted it was that the reference to Innocent was not carried out.

¹ *De gest. Pel.*, § 54 (*Op.* x. 220 B; *P. L.* xliv. 351); *Ep.* clxxxvi, § 36 (*Op.* ii. 675 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 829 sq.).

² *De gest. Pel.*, § 37 (*Op.* x. 213 A; *P. L.* xliv. 343).

³ Orosius, *Apol.*, § 6 (*Op.* 592 sq.; *P. L.* xxxi. 1178 B, C).

⁴ 'A useful institution,' says Augustine, who had a sense of humour, 'they prevent bad men from telling lies, and good men from forgetting,' *De gest. Pel.* (*Op.* x. 213 E; *P. L.* xliv. 344).

⁵ Orosius, *Apol.*, § 7 (*Op.* 593; *P. L.* xxxi. 1178).

⁶ Presbyters are now coming to be called 'sacerdotes' (*ibid.*), as well as the bishop.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 16 (*Op.* 601; *P. L.* xxxi. 1185 B).

⁸ *Ibid.*, §§ 16, 31, *ut sup.*

§ 3. Meanwhile, two Gallican bishops, Heros of Arles, 409-12, a disciple of St. Martin, and Lazarus of Aix, 409-12, both of whom were undeserving of the censures bestowed upon them by the hasty Zosimus,¹ 417-†18, had been ejected from their sees,² and had taken refuge in Palestine. Here they fraternized with Jerome and Orosius; and, finding the opinions of Pelagius busily discussed, they were 'offended', says Augustine, 'by his perverse disputations',³ and took the step which Orosius declined of drawing up a formal indictment. This they supported by extracts from his writings⁴; by the charges brought against Caelestius at Carthage,⁵ 411-12; by the opinions imputed to Pelagians in Sicily⁶; and by excerpts from an anonymous work generally attributed to Caelestius,⁷ and presented it to Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea 404-†17, and metropolitan of Palaestina I. He thereupon summoned thirteen bishops, including John of Jerusalem, to meet, in the ancient Lydda, at the Synod of Diospolis,⁸ 20 December 415. Eulogius presided: and Augustine gives the list of those present.⁹ Neither Heros nor Lazarus was there: the one, it appears, was ill, and the other would not come forward without him.¹⁰ Pelagius, therefore, was left with the advantage. For, when the indictment was read and interpreted, there was no promoter to take up the suit against him. Moreover, he knew Greek well, while his judges did not understand Latin¹¹; and as Easterns, they would be disposed to judge favourably a teacher who, like St. Chrysostom, was wont to insist on the power of the will. These preliminaries we gather, as well as the proceedings of the Council, from 'the minutes of the case of Pelagius' as preserved in Augustine, *De gestis Pelagii*,¹² written in 417. Pelagius then was called, and produced letters in his favour from illustrious

¹ Zosimus, *Epp.* ii, § 4, iii, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 651 A, 656 A); and contrast Aug. *De gest. Pel.*, § 53 (*Op.* x. 219 B; *P. L.* xlv. 350).

² Prosper, *Chronicon*, ad. ann. 412 (*Op.* 739; *P. L.* li. 590 sq.); *Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 21; Fleury, xxiii. v.

³ *De gest. Pel.*, § 53 (*Op.* x. 219 B; *P. L.* xlv. 350).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op.* x. 191 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 320).

⁵ *Ibid.*, §§ 23, 24 (*Op.* x. 204 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 333 sq.).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 23 (*Op.* x. 204; *P. L.* xlv. 334).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 29 (*Op.* x. 207 c; *P. L.* xlv. 337).

⁸ Mansi, iv. 311 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, ii. i. 177 sq. (*E. Tr.* ii. 450 sqq.); Fleury, xxiii. xx.

⁹ *Contra Iulianum*, i, §§ 19, 32 (*Op.* x. 507 F, 517 E; *P. L.* xlv. 652, 663).

¹⁰ *De gest. Pel.*, §§ 2, 39, 62 (*Op.* x. 191 sq., 213 D, 224 D; *P. L.* xlv. 329, 343, 355).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* x. 193 c; *P. L.* xlv. 321).

¹² *Op.* x. 191-228 (*P. L.* xlv. 319-60); W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* 150-201.

bishops,¹ including the courteous but irrelevant letter from Augustine himself.² The bishop of Jerusalem next gave an account of the proceedings of his Synod, not without reflections on Orosius³; and the charges were taken one by one, in four series :

(1) The first series⁴ consisted of certain propositions attributed to Pelagius, as from his own writings. They were ten in all : and he was asked whether he owned them, and if so, to explain.

(a) 'Have you said that the knowledge of the law is a sufficient safeguard against sin?' Pelagius explained, by a reference to the LXX of *Isa.* viii. 20 : 'He hath given unto them the help of the law'—that we are helped by the knowledge of the law not to sin : and the Council accepted the explanation.

(b) 'Have you said that all men are guided by their own will?' 'Yes, I said so because our will is free. God assists us to choose the good : and the man who sins is in fault, because he has free-will.' This was accepted.

(c) 'Have you said that, in the Day of Judgement, *all* sinners will be eternally condemned?' The accusers fastened upon the assertion because it did not distinguish sinners who had been forgiven through the merits of Christ, from sinners who had not sought such forgiveness and would therefore be condemned. Pelagius merely covered the statement by an appeal to *Matt.* xxv. 46 : 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.' The objection was captious, but interesting, for it drew from Pelagius a repudiation of Origenism : and the episode, together with Augustine's comments on it, is important as showing that, on all sides, Origen's universalism was regarded as heretical at that date. The Council readily assented to Pelagius' explanation.

(d) 'Have you said that evil does not even enter into the thoughts of the righteous?' 'No, it is a mere misrepresentation : what I said was that a Christian ought to take care to think no evil.'

(e) 'Have you said that the kingdom of heaven was promised even in the Old Testament?' Pelagius explained this to the satisfaction of the Synod, by a reference to *Dan.* vii. 18—'The saints of the most High shall take the kingdom' ; but in so doing, he availed himself of the ambiguity of the expression 'Old

¹ *De gest. Pel.*, § 50.

² *Ib.*, § 52.

³ *Ib.*, §§ 37-9.

⁴ *Ib.*, §§ 2-28.

Testament', to disguise the possible, and probably his real, meaning that the Law is as good as the Gospel, for the purposes of salvation. It might mean either the Old Testament Scriptures or the older religious system of which they are the record.

(*f, g, h, i*) 'Have you said that a man, if he likes, can be without sin; and written to a pious widow—Juliana, the mother of Demetrias—maintaining three propositions, suggesting something of the kind in her case?' Pelagius replied that 'on turning from sin, a man may by his own exertions and the grace of God, be without sin' is what he had really said. The Council caught at this recognition of grace; but did not stop to cross-examine Pelagius as to the sense in which he employed the term, and when he supported his denial that he had ignored it by anathematizing his opponents, not as heretics but as fools, they once more accepted his protestations.

(*k*) They passed on to a tenth statement attributed to him: that the Church on earth is 'without spot or wrinkle'. Pelagius explained that the Lord made it so in Baptism: and this was considered sufficient.

(2) The Synod next proceeded to question him in regard to a second series,¹ viz. the six counts charged against Caelestius at the Council of Carthage, 411-12. As to the fourth of these, that 'before the coming of Christ, there were men without sin', Pelagius explained that all *he* meant—whatever may have been the meaning of Caelestius—was that there were holy men in those days. He wished to assert not their sinlessness but their sanctity. For the other five propositions of Caelestius he disclaimed all responsibility, and, 'for the satisfaction of the Council', he went so far as to anathematize all who held them. In this way he condemned all denial of Original Sin: a point which Augustine is quick to fasten on, saying that, if Pelagius was absolved by the Council, it was only because Pelagianism had been 'first condemned by the Council and by its author'.

(3) A third series² consisted of the three articles referred to Augustine, as current in Sicily, by Hilary, a layman of Syracuse. One of these, 'that a man can be without sin if he will', had been previously explained by Pelagius to the Council, and the remaining two he now repudiated.

(4) The fourth and final series³ consisted of eleven statements

¹ *De gest. Pel.* §§ 23, 24.

² *Ibid.*, § 23.

³ *Ibid.*, §§ 29-42.

gathered, but not *verbatim*, as was admitted, from a book ascribed to Caelestius. In respect of the first of these that 'we do more than is commanded us', Pelagius observed that what he had said was that the virginal life was not commanded: to which the Synod, of course, assented. The second, that 'the grace and help of God is not given for each several act of duty but consists either in the original endowment of free-will or in law and teaching'; and the third, 'that grace is given according to merit, for were it given to sinners God would seem to act unjustly', Pelagius disowned for his part, but disingenuously. A fourth, that 'any one might possess all virtues and graces', is not important: he succeeded in explaining it to the satisfaction of the Council: and the remainder, up to the eleventh, which ran 'men must by penitence become worthy of mercy', he disposed of by disclaiming all responsibility for statements that were not his own.¹ Finally, he added a general affirmation of belief in the Trinity and in all that the Holy Catholic Church teaches: and on these terms he was recognized by the Synod as 'within the communion of the Catholic Church'.²

What then is the value of this acquittal? It was the question which Augustine set himself to consider in the pamphlet which he addressed to Aurelius of Carthage, *De gestis Pelagii*. 'Morally, none at all,' is his answer.³ He speaks of the Palestinian bishops with great respect. He points out that they were under great difficulties for getting evidence; they had the defendant before them, without his accusers; he spoke their language well, but they had to rely on an interpreter—not always accurate—for his⁴; and the controversy, as a whole, was strange and new to them.⁵ So situated, what more natural than that Eulogius and his fellow-bishops should acquit Pelagius? They would be disposed to place the best construction on his assurances⁶; and he thus obtained an acquittal on false pretences, and at the expense of opinions which they understood him to disown. Pelagius, of course, got no little prestige from the verdict, and made the most of it⁷; and Augustine himself was probably forced by policy to speak well of the Council. He says, indeed, that the business ought to have been adjourned till the accusers

¹ *De gest. Pel.* § 43.

⁴ *Ibid.*, §§ 2, 39.

² *Ibid.*, § 44.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 45.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 54 sq.

³ *Ibid.*, § 45.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 9.

came forward¹: a remark which shows how slowly the elementary principles of justice made way in the Church, e.g. that the accused must not have his own way without the presence of the accusers face to face. But he contends that, in acquitting Pelagius, they had condemned the main propositions of Pelagianism,² and holds that Pelagius 'stole absolution'.³ Nor had Jerome, though for different reasons, a better opinion of 'that wretched Synod of Diospolis'.⁴

§ 4. The immediate issue of the Synod was a triumph for Pelagius. The Latin colony at Bethlehem had been the headquarters of the opposition to him and his patron, John; and the situation looks very much like that of twenty-one years earlier when John drew down upon his head the wrath of Jerome and his friends for standing by Rufinus. Jerome, it is pretty clear, had made the bullets for Orosius, Heros, and Lazarus to shoot; and Pelagius now retaliated on Jerome.

(1) Pelagius himself was the first to take the field.⁵

(a) He wrote a letter, in a tone of 'carnal conceit and elation',⁶ informing a friend of his in Holy Orders that 'the judgement of the fourteen bishops has not only vindicated my statement that a man can be without sin, and *easily* keep the commandments of God, if he chooses; but it has completely broken up the whole band of conspirators'.⁷ The statement, however, as submitted to the Council, had not contained the word 'easily'—of such critical importance from the point of view of doctrine.

(b) He then addressed, to Augustine, a 'paper in defence of himself',⁸ and sent it by a citizen of Hippo named Charus, in deacon's Orders of some eastern diocese. Here he professes to give an account of the Synod and of his own replies to the 'Gallic' charges, in which he verbally acknowledges grace, and then proceeds to qualify his position.⁹

¹ *De gest. Pel.* § 45.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 3, 5, 8, 41, 45; *Contra Iulianum*, i, § 19, iii, § 4 (*Op.* x. 507 sq., 554 D; *P. L.* xlv. 652 sq., 703); *De gratia et lib. arb.*, § 10 (*Op.* x. 723; *P. L.* liv. 887 sq.); and *Ep.* clxxxvi, §§ 31 sqq. (*Op.* ii. 673 sqq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 827 sqq.).

³ 'Absolutionem suam fallendo furatus est,' *De pecc. orig.*, § 15 (*Op.* x. 259 F; *P. L.* xlv. 393).

⁴ *Ep.* cxliii, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1067; *P. L.* xxii. 1181).

⁵ Fleury, xxiii. xxix.

⁶ *De gest. Pel.*, § 55 (*Op.* x. 220 E; *P. L.* xlv. 350).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 54 (*Op.* x. 219 E; *P. L.* xlv. 350).

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 57 (*Op.* x. 221 E; *P. L.* xlv. 353).

⁹ *Ep.* clxxix, §§ 7, 8 (*Op.* ii. 632; *P. L.* xxxiii. 776).

(c) Further, he addressed to Jerome his *Pro libero arbitrio*¹ in four books. Here again he acknowledged grace; but limited its scope to the 'capacity' for goodness, bestowed, as he said, by the Creator, as distinct from 'volition' and 'action'. The two latter he referred entirely to man's will; and even under this limitation, he represented grace as merely 'facilitating obedience'; or as consisting of instruction, warning, promises; or, more properly, of the example of Christ.² Thus he confined God's grace to the office of 'assisting the capacity'³; but the point is, How? It turned out that the assistance was, in the past, only by remission of sins; and in the future, by the moral value of our Lord's example and nothing more. And a passage asserting that man is born 'with a capacity for either good or bad but with nothing besides' is a virtual denial of any inherited taint.⁴ Pelagius, it may be added here, admitted grace in six senses: as (1) Nature with free-will, (2) Remission of sins, (3) Law and Teaching, (4) Inward illumination, (5) Baptismal adoption, and (6) Eternal Life. Augustine's contention is that take these, and specially the moral example of our Lord (which, after all, is only teaching, though a very persuasive form of it) in their fullest sense, yet all fall short of what St. Paul means by grace.⁵ He looks upon Pelagius' language as consistently evasive⁶; and in one place he points out that Pelagius appears to regard grace as given *ex abundanti*.⁷

§ 5. Next year, another protagonist on the Pelagian side entered the lists against Jerome: for Theodore, bishop of Mop-suestia 392-†428, in 416 published five books under the title *Against those who say that men sin by nature and not by their own will*.⁸ It was a cleverly framed title, because it implies that

¹ Bardenhewer, 504.

² *De gratia Christi*, § 45 (*Op.* x. 248; *P. L.* xliv. 380), where note the comment of Augustine on the inadequate senses in which Pelagius admitted grace; and see W. Bright, *Lessons*, &c., app. xix.

³ *Ibid.*, § 5 (*Op.* x. 232 A; *P. L.* xliv. 362): 'possibilitatem adiuvat': 'the phrase supposes a foundation of independent power in the will, to which Grace is an addition,' Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 55 sq.

⁴ 'Capaces utriusque rei,' *De pecc. orig.*, § 14 (*Op.* x. 258 E, F; *P. L.* xliv. 391), and Document No. 131.

⁵ D. Petavius, *De Pel. et Semi-Pel. Hist.* ii, § 4 (*Op.* iii. 596: Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1644).

⁶ *De gest. Pel.*, § 47 (*Op.* x. 216 sq.; *P. L.* xliv. 347); *Ep.* clxxix, § 3 (*Op.* ii. 630 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 774.)

⁷ *Ep.* clxxxvi, §§ 34, 35 (*Op.* ii. 675; *P. L.* xxxiii. 829).

⁸ For information about this book, and excerpts from it, we are indebted to (a) Marius Mercator, *Symbolum Theodori* (*P. L.* xlviii. 219 A); and (b) Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. clxxvii (*Op.* iii. 121; *P. G.* ciii. 513).

Jerome and Augustine were insulting Nature, and disparaging God's handiwork; and the latter, as is well known, had great difficulty in shaking off this imputation of Manichaeism.¹ Marius Mercator will have it that Theodore's book was directed against Augustine; but Augustine was his master. The attack was meant for Jerome.² To do Theodore justice, we must remember his moral zeal; he had a deep sense of the power of our Lord's human example. So he posed as a conservative Christian, objecting to this new 'plague from the West'. 'It was an invention of Aram' (Hieronymus), he said, 'an exceedingly conceited person who, because he knows a little Hebrew thinks it his duty to put every one to rights.'³ Five propositions⁴ sum up his arraignment of Jerome as teaching that (a) Sin comes not from choice but from corrupted nature; (b) Infants are tainted with sin from birth, and receive baptism and the eucharist for its remission; (c) No man is righteous; (d) Even Christ, since He took our nature, could not be sinless; and (e) Marriage is of the province of the corrupted nature. These propositions are as clever as the title of the treatise which contained them: they are all of the nature of a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Catholic position. They are also important as showing what was attributed to Catholics by their adversaries; while Theodore's comments are not less interesting, as, for instance, when, in respect of the second, he proceeds to give his rationale of Infant Baptism. 'It is in order', as he says, 'to that remission of sins which they will attain in the last day.'⁵ Jerome, at whom these shafts were aimed, did not see the treatise. If he had,—! But it might have been too much for the old man; and, as it was, some Pelagians, of a rougher sort, made a raid on the monastery at Bethlehem, and Jerome barely escaped with his life.⁶

So ends the second, or Palestinian, stage of the controversy: its third belongs to Africa and Rome, 416-18.

§ 6. In the spring of 416 Orosius returned to Africa.

He brought a letter from Jerome to Augustine,⁷ and another from Heros and Lazarus which was read⁸ at the Council of

¹ e. g. *De nat. et grat.*, § 21 (*Op.* x. 135; *P. L.* xlv. 256).

² Marius M., *op. cit.* (*P. L.* xlviii. 222 D, n. 3).

³ Photius, *ut sup.*

⁴ *Ibid.*; Fleury, xxiii. xxviii.

⁵ *Ibid.* (*Op.* iii. 122 B; *P. G.* ciii. 517 A).

⁶ *De gest. Pel.*, § 66 (*Op.* x. 227 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 358); Jerome, *Epp.* cxxxv-cxxxvii (*Op.* ii. 1044-6; *P. L.* xxii. 1161-4); Jaffé, Nos. 325-7.

⁷ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxxiv (*Op.* i. 1042-4; *P. L.* xxii. 1161 sq.).

⁸ Aug. *Ep.* clxxv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 617 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 759).

Carthage¹ of midsummer, 416, before some seventy bishops of Proconsular Africa under the presidency of Aurelius. Augustine, of course, was not among them, for Hippo belonged to the province of Numidia. In their Synodal Letter,² addressed to Pope Innocent, they inform him that, § 1, not content with the condemnation of Caelestius 'some five years ago', they think it desirable that both Pelagius and Caelestius should be anathematized, unless they will anathematize their errors for the protection of others. Let Innocent, § 2, therefore support the Council 'with the weight of the Apostolic See'; for, § 3, Pelagius does not admit grace in the Scriptural sense. If the Pope should think, § 4, on looking at the minutes of Diospolis, that Pelagius was rightly acquitted, then let him reflect that Pelagianism is incompatible with the institutions of the Church: whether with prayer—on this theory, our Lord need not have taught His disciples to pray 'Lead us not into temptation', and ought not to have bidden us 'Watch and pray' but only 'Watch', while the precatory blessing, § 5, which we bishops use 'over the people'³ that 'they may be strengthened with might by the Holy Spirit in the inner man'⁴ is also, on this theory, made in vain—or, again, § 6, with Infant Baptism. We look, therefore, with confidence to the judgement of your Reverence: and desire your prayers, most blessed Pope.

Next, at the Council of Milevum,⁵ the bishops of Numidia, to the number of sixty-one, under their primate, Silvanus of Summa, met in 416, Augustine among them. They also wrote to Pope Innocent⁶: quoted, § 2, 'God will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able,' from 1 *Cor.* x. 13, as fatal to Pelagian naturalism; drew his attention, § 3, to the impiety of an error which robbed adults of prayer and infants of Baptism; and expressed, § 5, their conviction that the offenders would 'give

¹ Mansi, iv. 321 sq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 183 sq. (E. Tr. ii. 455); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 690; Fleury, xxiii. xxx.

² Aug. *Ep.* clxxv (*Op.* ii. 617–20; *P. L.* xxxiii. 758–62).

³ For the episcopal benediction, *super populum*, in the Gallican rite, at the moment of Communion, see Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*⁵, 101 sq., 222 sq.

⁴ *Eph.* iii. 14–16. Note this argument for the meaning of Grace: (a) nothing less than the *personal* operation of the Holy Spirit within the soul; (b) something more than 'favour': its ecclesiastical is fuller than its biblical sense.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 325 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 184 sq. (E. Tr. ii. 455); Fleury, xxxiii. xxx.

⁶ Aug. *Ep.* clxxvi (*Op.* ii. 620–2; *P. L.* xxxiii. 762–4).

way to the authority of his Holiness drawn from the authority of the Holy Scriptures'.

Once more, in support of these endeavours to gain the ear of Innocent, Augustine and four other bishops, who were personally known to him, expostulated with the Pope in a private letter, 416. Considerable anxiety was felt in Africa as to the line which the Roman church would take.¹ Pelagius had lived for some time in Rome, and was held in esteem there.² Two dignitaries, Zosimus who as Pope, 417-†18, succeeded Innocent, and Sixtus, who also became Pope, 432-†40, were known to be favourable towards him³; others held that he had received nothing but his due when acquitted at Diospolis.⁴ Fearing, therefore, that Innocent should be won over to his side, the five prelates⁵ point out, § 2, that the Palestinians only acquitted him because he had verbally admitted grace. The question, however, § 3, is not whether Pelagius is guilty or otherwise of heresy, though it would be as well if the Pope would summon him to Rome and examine him as to 'what he means by the grace that he confesses'—usually, §§ 4, 5, no more than 'free will, remission of sins, or the Law'; anything, indeed, short of the help of the Holy Spirit. The question is whether the doctrine ascribed to Pelagius should or should not find a place in the Catholic Church. So they beg to send to the Pope, § 6, copies of Pelagius' *De natura* and of Augustine's *De natura et gratia* written in reply; and they have taken the liberty of marking important passages in the latter which they trust his Holiness 'will not find it irksome to look at'. About the same time Augustine also sent copies of the book of Pelagius and of his rejoinder to John bishop of Jerusalem⁶; and dispatched a letter,⁷ both long and important, to Paulinus of Nola, 353-†431—a friend of Pelagius⁸ but a poor theologian—to put him on his guard⁹ and detach him, if possible, from the Pelagian interest: for the sanctity of Paulinus would have lent great *éclat* to his side. In it he summarizes the controversy, and then enters on its merits. 'In particular, he refutes the fancy of those who,

¹ Possidius, *Vita*, § 18 (*Op.* x, app. 269 E; *P. L.* xxxii. 48).

² *Ep.* clxxvii, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 622 F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 765).

³ *Ep.* cxciv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 715 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 874).

⁴ *Ep.* clxxvii, § 2 (*ut sup.*).

⁵ *Ep.* clxxvii (*Op.* ii. 622-8; *P. L.* xxxiii. 764-72); Fleury, xxiii. xxx.

⁶ *Ep.* clxxix (*Op.* ii. 630-3; *P. L.* xxxiii. 774-8); Fleury, xxiii. xxxi.

⁷ *Ep.* clxxxvi (*Op.* ii. 663-76; *P. L.* xxxiii. 815-32); Fleury, xxiii. xxxviii.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 1.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 29.

not daring to deny the necessity of Baptism and not choosing to acknowledge original sin, affirmed that infants sinned before they were born ' ¹ ; and the letter is important in that, in the course of this refutation, Augustine develops his views of ' merit ' ² and of predestination ³ as an absolute selection of a ' certain number ' ⁴ of souls out of the multitude of ' vessels of wrath ', and so as the necessary explanation of the non-salvation of infants dying unbaptized. ⁵

§ 7. The three letters to Pope Innocent, 402-†17, were delivered by a bishop named Julius, and on 27 January 417 he wrote three several replies ⁶ : (a) The first—*In requirendis* ⁷—was addressed to the Council of Carthage. His episcopate, it should not be forgotten, is a land-mark in the development of the Papal theory : and ' it is only owing to the fame and power of St. Leo, 440-†61, who, soon after, succeeded to the Bishopric of Rome, that the part he took in originating the Papacy has not been fully recognized '. ⁸ Accordingly, he begins, § 1, by congratulating the Africans on having referred the matter—though they had done no such thing—to the ' judgement ' of his see, which he describes as ' the source of the whole episcopate ' ; and, further, on having so acted ' because the institutions of the fathers decreed . . . that whatsoever was done in the provinces . . . should not be taken as concluded, until it had come to the knowledge of this See '. There is nothing in the carefully worded reference of the matter to Rome by the Africans to suggest that they had acted on these grounds ; and no such ' decree of the fathers ' is known to exist. ⁹ The Pope then set forth, §§ 4-7, the need of Grace, because of our dependence upon God, and pronounced, §§ 8-9, that, as Pelagius and Caelestius had denied it, they were therefore ' excommunicate '. ¹⁰

(b) By *Inter caeteras*, ¹¹ he replied, in much the same terms to the Council of Milevum, magnifying, at the outset, § 2, the duty of reference to Peter. He then observes, § 3, that the Pelagian practically says, What need have I of God ? and that, § 5, his

¹ Ibid., §§ 12, 13.

² Ibid., § 16.

³ Ibid., §§ 23, 24.

⁴ Ibid., §§ 25, 26.

⁵ Ibid., §§ 27-30.

⁶ Aug. *Epp.* clxxxi-clxxxiii (*Op.* ii. 635-42 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 779-88) = Innocent, *Epp.* xxix-xxxi (*P. L.* xx. 582-97) ; Fleury, xxiii. xxxiv. In this correspondence the question of Original Sin does not come up.

⁷ Jaffé, No. 321.

⁸ E. Denny, *Papalism*, § 638.

⁹ Ibid., § 636.

¹⁰ See also *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 6 (*Op.* x. 435 ; *P. L.* xlv. 575).

¹¹ Jaffé, No. 322.

theory is incompatible with yet a third institution of the Church, viz. Infant Communion, in favour of which he cites 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you'.¹

(c) Finally, by *Fraternitatis vestrae*² he replies to the five prelates. He can, § 2, neither affirm nor deny that there are Pelagians at Rome; for, if there are any, they take care to lie low. As to Pelagius' alleged acquittal, § 3, he had his doubts. Some laymen, indeed, had brought him a document professing to be the minutes of the Council of Diospolis; but, as he could not be sure of its authenticity, he had refrained from pronouncing upon the sentence. If Pelagius, § 4, ought to be sent for, let it be done by those who are nearer. His book, § 5, which we have read, is enough to condemn him. 'God have you in His keeping, dearest brethren.'

These letters were almost the last to which the great Pope, Innocent I, set his hand, for he died on 12 March 417—a prelate, says Milman, apart from his 'rank and position', of 'commanding character'.³ Their arrival in Africa caused the liveliest joy; and it was with reference to them, and to the rejoicings with which they were received, that, in a sermon at Carthage of 23 September 417, Augustine expressed himself in a summary of the situation usually but incorrectly quoted as *Roma locuta est: causa finita est*—as if the Papal decision *alone*⁴ had settled the matter. But what he actually said was that 'in this matter [the decisions of] two councils', Carthage and Milevum, to wit, 'have been sent to the Apostolic See. Rescripts have come thence as well. The cause is finished.'⁵ It was 'finished' on the *joint* authority of the decisions of the two African Councils and the replies which the Pope had returned to them.

It is remarkable that all these decisions had been taken before

¹ John vi. 53. His argument is quoted with approval by Augustine in *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 7 (*Op.* x. 435 sq.; *P. L.* xliv. 576), and used by him in *ib.* i, § 40 (*Op.* x. 429 sq.; *P. L.* xliv. 570); and *Sermo*, clxxiv, § 7 (*Op.* v. 834 A; *P. L.* xxxviii. 943 sq.); cf. J. Bingham, *Ant.* xv. iv, § 7.

² Jaffé, No. 323.

³ H. H. Milman, *Latin Chr.* i. 112.

⁴ Elsewhere he says it was settled by Councils, the Apostolic See, and the Roman Church and Empire, *De pecc. orig.*, § 18 (*Op.* x. 260 G; *P. L.* xliv. 394).

⁵ 'Iam enim de hac causa duo concilia missa sunt ad Sedem Apostolicam: inde etiam rescripta venerunt; causa finita est,' *Sermo*, cxxxi, § 10 (*Op.* v. 645 D; *P. L.* xxxviii. 734): see W. Bright, *Roman See*, 130; E. Denny, *Papalism*, § 632.

any one, either in Africa or in Rome, had possessed himself of a certified copy of the proceedings in Palestine. Like Innocent, Augustine also had his doubts. He suspected even that the minutes of the acquittal of Pelagius at Diospolis were purposely kept back¹; and wrote, as we have seen, to John of Jerusalem, asking for a copy,² on the ground of the incompatibility³ of some statements in the 'paper'⁴ received from Pelagius with the language of the book ascribed to him, to which his own *De natura et gratia* was a reply. At last, 416-17, the minutes came into Augustine's hands. He at once perceived that the 'paper' of Pelagius was no fair account of the proceedings⁵; and was 'thankful' to find in the authorized record that the acquittal of Pelagius was really a condemnation of Pelagianism.⁶ To enforce this conclusion, he wrote, and addressed to Aurelius, the *De gestis Pelagii*,⁷ 417.

§ 8. Zosimus, 18 March 417-† December 418, succeeded Innocent; and, if we may judge from his name, was a Greek.⁸ We know nothing of his antecedents; but his short, yet troublous, record contrasts sharply with that of his predecessor, and he cannot have enjoyed that long training in administration customary with the Roman clergy which produced from their ranks a succession of calm and wise rulers like Innocent I. 'Zosimus', says Mgr. Duchesne, 'was an anomaly',⁹ and his pontificate a series of blunders. First among them was the favour he showed¹⁰ to Patroclus,¹¹ bishop of Arles 412-†26, an adventurer whom Constantius III, February to September 421, now brother-in-law of Honorius by his marriage,¹² 1 January 417, with Galla Placidia,

¹ *De gest. Pel.*, § 55 (*Op.* x. 220 E; *P. L.* xliv. 351).

² *Ep.* clxxix, § 7 (*Op.* ii. 632 C; *P. L.* xxxiii. 776).

³ *Ibid.*, §§ 2-6 (*Op.* ii. 630-2; *P. L.* xxxiii. 774-6).

⁴ *De gest. Pel.*, § 57 (*Op.* x. 222 E; *P. L.* xliv. 353).

⁵ *Ibid.*, §§ 57-8 (*Op.* x. 221-3; *P. L.* xliv. 352-4).

⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 2, 65 (*Op.* x. 191 sq., 226; *P. L.* xliv. 320, 358).

⁷ *Op.* x. 191-228 (*P. L.* xliv. 319-60).

⁸ So *Lib. Pont.*; but its value 'for the time at which we now are', on such a point, is doubtful, L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, iii. 228, n. 1.

⁹ *Hist. anc.* iii. 228.

¹⁰ Preface, § 9, to Zos. *Epp.* ii, iii, in *P. L.* xx. 648 sq.

¹¹ Fleury, xxiii. iv, xlv. Patroclus was a partisan of Constantius, the general who put down the usurper Constantine, 407-†11; Heros, on the other hand, was a partisan of Constantine, by whom he had been intruded into the see of Arles, according to Zosimus, *Ep.* ii, § 4 (*P. L.* xx. 651 A).

¹² Soz. *H. E.* ix. xvi; and, for the events preceding it, Gibbon, c. xxxi (iii. 340 sqq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 823 sqq.

390-†450, had intruded into the see after banishing Heros.¹ On Maundy Thursday, 22 March 417, by *Placuit Apostolicae*,² Zosimus disregarded existing rights, and not only conferred upon him metropolitan authority in four of the provinces of southern Gaul³ but made him Papal Vicar over the whole of Gaul,⁴ with powers like those of the bishop of Thessalonica in Eastern Illyricum. Zosimus alleged, in support of these innovations, that the see of Arles had been founded by Trophimus, an envoy from Rome, and was therefore the mother-church of Gaul.⁵ The system of metropolitans was barely set up in Gaul; but one or two sees held that rank.⁶ Protests accordingly were received from the bishops of Vienne and Narbonne, each of whose sees was a civil metropolis; and again from the bishop of Marseilles who, though his see was not situated in a civil metropolis, enjoyed a similar authority over *Narbonensis II*; but they were overruled.⁷ Zosimus had an eye only for his *protégé*, Patroclus. It was not to be expected, therefore, that Zosimus would do otherwise than receive with interest an appeal from men whose reputation had suffered under the accusations of Patroclus' rival, Heros, the rightful bishop of Arles and his associate, who had also incurred the displeasure of Zosimus,⁸ Lazarus, bishop of Aix. They were not the men to recommend the doctrine of Augustine to the Pope.

(1) It may have been with some knowledge of the turn which events were thus taking in Rome that Caelestius, in 417, made his way thither. After his condemnation at Carthage, 412, he had gone to Ephesus and been ordained priest.⁹ Thence he went on to Constantinople; but was driven away by Atticus,¹⁰ the foe and the second successor, 406-†25, of Chrysostom. At last he made for Rome, where Zosimus took him up.¹¹ By way of prosecuting

¹ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 412 (*Op.* 739; *P. L.* li. 589). Constantius seems to have chased Heros out because, in the siege of Arles, 411, he tried to save the life of Constantine by ordaining him to the presbyterate, *Soz. H. E.* ix. xv.

² Zosimus, *Ep.* i (*P. L.* xx. 642-5); Jaffé, No. 328.

³ Vienne, Narbonne I and II, and the Maritime Alps, *ib.*, § 2 (*P. L.* xx. 644 A); and Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 230.

⁴ *Zos. Ep.* i, § 1 (*P. L.* xx. 643 A).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 644 sq.).

⁶ In 400, at the Co. of Turin, Vienne and Arles were at issue over metropolitan rights in *Viennensis*, c. 2; Hefele, ii. 426 sq.

⁷ Zosimus, *Epp.* vi, x, xi (*P. L.* xx. 666 sqq.); Jaffé, No. 332, 340, 341.

⁸ Zosimus, *Ep.* ii, § 4, iii, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 651 A, 656 A).

⁹ Marius Merc. *Comm.*, § 2 (*P. L.* xlvi. 70-3).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*P. L.* xlvi. 73).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 4 (*P. L.* xlvi. 75 A); Aug. *De pecc. orig.*, § 8 (*Op.* x. 256; *P. L.* xlv. 388 sq.).

the appeal which, five years earlier, he made to the Apostolic See, Caelestius now presented a confession of faith, recapitulating all the articles of the creed 'from the Trinity to the Resurrection of the dead'. It was diffuse on the points not in question, but silent on the real issue; and Augustine is impatient at its irrelevance. 'If', concludes Caelestius, 'any disputes have arisen on questions that form no part of the faith . . . I merely offer for your Apostolic examination my conclusions from the Scriptures; that, if I have erred through ignorance, your judgment may correct me.¹ I hold that infants ought to be baptized for remission of sins according to the rule of the universal Church and the authority of the Gospel, for the Lord has declared that the kingdom of heaven can be given to none but the baptized.² I do not, however, infer from this the theory of a transmitted sinfulness—an inference utterly alien to the Catholic doctrine. According to it, sin is not born with man: it is man who commits sin after his birth. Sin, in fact, is not the fault of nature but of will.'³ Caelestius means that there is no sin which is not personal⁴; and he insinuates that to maintain Original Sin is Manichæan. On receiving this confession of Caelestius, Zosimus proceeded to examine him before a local synod,⁵ September 417, in the basilica of San Clemente.⁶ We do not possess its minutes; but we know what took place there from *Magnum pondus*,⁷ September 417, his letter to the Africans; from the *Libellus*,⁸ 417, of Paulinus the Deacon, the accuser of Caelestius at Carthage; and from the *De peccato originali*,⁹ 418, of St. Augustine. Caelestius was introduced, and his written confession read. It expressed, he replied, in answer to the Pope's repeated interrogations, his real mind.¹⁰ Asked to condemn the statements imputed to him by Paulinus at Carthage, he refused to do so. He was willing to accept the doctrine laid down in the letters of Pope Innocent;

¹ *De pecc. orig.*, § 26 (*Op.* x. 263 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 397), and Document No. 132.

² *Ibid.*, § 5 (*Op.* x. 255; *P. L.* xlv. 388), and Document No. 132.

³ *Ibid.*, § 6 (*Op.* x. 255; *P. L.* xlv. 388), and Document No. 132.

⁴ The answer to Caelestius, of course, is: In regard to *what* sin ought infants then to be baptized?

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 720 sqq.; Fleury, xxiii. xlii.

⁶ Zosimus, *Ep.* ii, § 2 (*P. L.* xx. 650 A).

⁷ *Ibid.* (*P. L.* xx. 649-54); Jaffé, No. 329.

⁸ *Aug. Op.* x, app. 102-4 (*P. L.* xlv. 1724).

⁹ *De pecc. orig.*, §§ 5-8 (*Op.* x. 255 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 388 sq.).

¹⁰ Zos. *Ep.* ii, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 650 B). The question implied that the written confession itself was free from error, according to Zosimus.

and nothing but approval was found for his confession of faith and for his declaration¹ at Carthage in acceptance of baptism for infants. As for the charges of Heros and Lazarus, they knew little of him. He had only met Lazarus 'in passing'²: while Heros had since apologized to him. The synod was thus led to believe that the Africans, and even Innocent, had gone too fast, and that too much credit had been given to gentry like Heros and Lazarus. Zosimus accordingly wrote to the Africans in this sense.³ He deposed Heros and Lazarus,⁴ not without reflections on their character⁵; and unheard. He assured Aurelius and his colleagues that 'the faith of Caelestius was completely satisfactory'⁶; granted a delay of two months for further representations on their part; and hinted that they had been going too fast and too far.⁷ He himself as Tillemont drily remarks, 'went a little faster'⁸; for, instead of acting on the principle of judicial caution that he was recommending, he had condemned the accusers of Caelestius in absence; sent off a letter full of kindness, as Tillemont observes, for Caelestius alone; and ventured the opinion that, after all, the question at issue was curious and needless.⁹ Constantine, it will be remembered, similarly endeavoured to belittle the gravity of the question at issue in the Arian controversy, in his letter to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria.¹⁰ But want of discernment in theology is one thing in an Emperor: quite another in a Pope.

(2) Pelagius also succeeded in bringing his case to the notice of Pope Zosimus. His patron, John, had been succeeded by Praylius, 'a man who well deserved the name',¹¹ as bishop of Jerusalem, 416-†25. He also seems to have thought Pelagius hardly used: and now sent, as for Innocent, a letter¹² testifying to his soundness of faith, which Pelagius enclosed with a letter¹³ and doctrinal

¹ Aug. *Ep.* clvii, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 552 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 685).

² Zos. *Ep.* ii, § 4 (*P. L.* xx. 651 A).

³ Zosimus, *Ep.* ii. (*P. L.* xx. 649-54); Jaffé, No. 329.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 4 (*P. L.* xx. 651).

⁵ He speaks of them as 'turbines ecclesiae', *Ep.* iii, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 656 A); Aug. as 'bonos fratres', *De gest. Pel.*, § 53 (*Op.* x. 219 B; *P. L.* xlv. 350).

⁶ 'Absoluta Caelestii fide,' Zos. *Ep.* ii, § 6 (*P. L.* xx. 652 B).

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 722.

⁹ Zos. *Ep.* ii, § 6 (*P. L.* xx. 652).

¹⁰ Socr. *H. E.* i. vii, §§ 3 sqq.

¹¹ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxviii, § 1.

¹² Not extant, but acknowledged in Zos. *Ep.* iii, § 2 (*P. L.* xx. 654 B), Praylius afterwards revised his opinion about Pelagius, Marius Merc. *Comm.* iii, § 5 (*P. L.* xlviii. 101).

¹³ Aug. *De grat. Chr.*, § 32 (*Op.* x. 244 B; *P. L.* xlv. 376).

statement of his own.¹ The three documents were carried to Rome by Caelestius; and so they reached Zosimus. And the correspondence also seems to have been accompanied by the recent treatise of Pelagius in four books, *Pro libero arbitrio*.² In the treatise, Pelagius made concessions in form; and so concealed his opinions from all but the practised eye.³ In the letter, two things, he said, were laid to his charge⁴: first, that he had refused to admit infants to baptism and had promised them the kingdom of heaven without it—whereas no such charge had been made, and he was merely making use of the logicians' trick known as *ignoratio elenchi*⁵; secondly, that he put so much confidence in free-will as to deny the assistance of grace. Verbally, he did not deny it. 'We have a free-will', says the letter 'either to sin, or to forbear sinning; and in all good works it is ever aided by the Divine assistance. In Christians only it is assisted by grace. In non-Christians, the good of their original creation is naked and unarmed. The latter will be judged for not using their free-will so as to obtain the grace of God: the former will be rewarded because, by using their free-will aright, they merit the grace of God, and keep His commandments.' Here, at any rate, the real error comes out. Assisted by *what* grace? And again, 'it is clear enough', says Augustine, 'that he means grace is given according to merit'.⁶ But perhaps it escaped the notice of his judges; befogged, as they may well have been, by the irrelevances of the doctrinal statement. In this *Libellus Fidei*, still extant, Pelagius, like Caelestius in his confession, discussed every point that was not in question from the Trinity to the Resurrection of the flesh. On the doctrines of the Trinity⁷ and of the Incarnate Person⁸ of our Lord, he anticipates the exact definitions of the *Quicunque vult* and the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. On baptism he is quite explicit, that 'it ought to be administered in the same form of words to infants as to adults'.⁹ At last, he seems to come to the point, 'We confess free-will, but hold at the same time that we stand continually in need of the Divine

¹ q.v. in Aug. *Op.* x, app. 96 sq. (*P. L.* xlv. 1716 sq.).

² *De grat. Chr.*, § 45 (*Op.* x. 248; *P. L.* xlv. 380).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 32 (*Op.* x. 244 c; *P. L.* xlv. 376).

⁵ *De pecc. orig.*, § 19 (*Op.* x. 261 B, c; *P. L.* xlv. 394).

⁶ *De grat. Chr.*, §§ 33, 34 (*Op.* x. 244 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 377).

⁷ *Libellus Fidei*, § 3 (Aug. *Op.* x, app. 96 c; *P. L.* xlv. 1716); cf. the *Quicunque*, v. 25.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 4 (app. 96 E; *P. L.* xlv. 1717).

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 7 (app. 97 B; *P. L.* xlv. 1718).

assistance'.¹ 'True,' is Augustine's comment, 'but what sort of assistance? That is the real issue: and that Pelagius avoids.'² But the papal eye was not so keen as to notice the evasion; and Pelagius had nicely calculated effects. On receiving his letter and enclosures Zosimus summoned another synod (for they reached him after the assembly in San Clemente was over), and on 21 September 417 sent a second letter—*Postquam a nobis*³—to Aurelius and his colleagues in Africa. 'We have already, § 1, written to you', says Zosimus, 'about Caelestius.' Now we have letters from Praylius, § 2, as well as from Pelagius himself. They show that he spoke at Jerusalem precisely as Caelestius here at Rome. If only, dear brethren, you had been here to hear them read! Hardly was there a place where they did not speak of 'the grace or help of God'. Pelagius has been maligned, § 3, and that, by busybodies like Heros and Lazarus, of whose shady antecedents we send you a few particulars, perhaps unknown to you hitherto. They ought to have been present to support their allegations: and so ought Timasius and James. You were somewhat too hasty in giving credit to what such accusers said. We trust, §§ 5-7, that you will be more circumspect in the future, and rejoice to find that, § 8, Pelagius and Caelestius 'have not been brought back like the prodigal but have never been separated from the Catholic truth'. We send you copies of Pelagius' writings. You will be glad to see that—as we said of Caelestius—'his faith' also is 'completely satisfactory'.⁴ Zosimus had now committed himself hopelessly. True, his mistakes cannot be quoted as fatal to Papal Infallibility.⁵ He erred on a question of *fact* only, as to whether certain persons did or did not hold the right faith; but it was 'a very hasty judgement in a matter touching the very centre of the faith'.⁶ Augustine had, therefore, to minimize the ill-judged action of Zosimus, if, as he desires to do, he was to represent Rome as consistently anti-Pelagian, and

¹ *Libellus Fidei*, § 13 (app. 97 D; *P. L.* xlv. 1718).

² *De grat. Chr.*, § 36 (*Op.* x. 245 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 378).

³ Zosimus, *Ep.* iii (*P. L.* xx. 654-61); Jaffé, No. 330; Fleury, xxiii. xlv.

⁴ 'Absoluta eius fide,' § 8 (*P. L.* xx. 661).

⁵ 'Romanum Pontificem, cum ex cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens . . . doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit . . . infallibilitate pollere' is the definition: see H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, No. 1682.

⁶ E. B. Pusey, *Second Letter to Dr. Newman*, 219; and W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xl.

to maintain his respect for the Roman See.¹ Perhaps Zosimus 'dealt rather more leniently', he says, 'with the case than the stern discipline of the Church demanded'.² But the language of the letter of Zosimus goes beyond mere lenity. He speaks of the 'faith' both of Caelestius and of Pelagius as 'sound',³ and of their statements as 'a good Confession'.⁴ The truth is, not that Zosimus was a Pelagian, but that he was deceived by language which was orthodox enough in appearance, but yet left the door open to error. Nor need we be surprised. The subject was new to him; and Augustine tells us that he too was nearly taken in by the language of Pelagius at first sight⁵ when, on the arrival of the letters of Zosimus in Africa, 2 November 417, he read the enclosures they contained.

§ 9. The Africans were already aware of the trend of the theological opinion in Rome. As early as the summer of 417 they had put Paulinus of Nola on his guard against the opinions in favour with the Pope and his entourage⁶; and they were more or less on the defensive themselves. Paulinus, for instance, the deacon who had laid information against Caelestius five years previously and was still at Carthage when summoned by Basiliscus, the bearer of the letters of Zosimus, 2 November 417, to sustain his accusations before the Pope in person, sent off a *Libellus*,⁷ 8 November 417, instead, and declined to go: the judge had already declared for his adversary. Then the Primate himself took action. Hastily summoning the few bishops at Carthage, he prepared a lengthy memorial to Zosimus in answer to his letter about Caelestius. 'Let him leave things *in statu quo* till he should be better informed about the case.'⁸ Next, when the bishops had

¹ He slurs over his false steps in *De pecc. orig.*, § 8 (*Op.* x. 256; *P. L.* xlv. 388 sq.), but just hints them in §§ 9, 24 (*Op.* x. 256, 262 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 389, 396) by saying that Pelagius hoodwinked the Synod of Palestine, but did not *ultimately* succeed in hoodwinking 'that See': see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 726.

² *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 5 (*Op.* x. 433 F; *P. L.* xlv. 574).

³ 'Absoluta fides' is the term that he uses (a) of Caelestius (*Ep.* ii, § 6); (b) of both Pelagius and Caelestius (*Ep.* iii, § 2); and (c) of Pelagius (*Ep.* iii, § 8).

⁴ *Zos. Ep.* ii, § 5 (*P. L.* xx. 652 B).

⁵ *De pecc. orig.*, § 20 (*Op.* x. 261 E; *P. L.* xlv. 394).

⁶ *Aug. Ep.* clxxxvi, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 677 F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 852); and L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, iii. 234 n.

⁷ q.v. in *Aug. Op.* x, app. 102-4 (*P. L.* xlv. 1724), or *Coll. Avell.*, No. 47 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 108-11); and on it see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 729; Fleury, xxiii. xlvii; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 235.

⁸ This 'memorial' or 'obtestatio' is lost; but its contents are more or less recoverable from the reply, [esp. § 2] of Zosimus, *Quamvis patrum*, of

increased to 214 at the Council of Carthage¹ in November 417, Aurelius and his colleagues passed certain resolutions on the doctrinal aspects of the question, and embodied them in a second letter to Zosimus with the following preface: 'We have enacted that the sentence which the venerable bishop Innocent pronounced against Pelagius and Caelestius shall still continue till they shall unequivocally confess that the grace of Jesus Christ assists us not only to know, but also to do, what is right in every action: so that without it we can neither have, think, say nor do anything that belongs to true piety.'² This would be astonishing language to use to a Pope, on the modern ultramontane theory; but there was an admixture of courtesy and adroitness in so appealing from the living Pope to the authority of his predecessor. It saved respect for the See, and at the same time gently hinted to its then occupant that he had been ill-advised. Zosimus, they went on, should not be content with a 'vague assent' on the part of Caelestius to the letter of Innocent. That would not be enough for the weak brother; and would be bad for the credit of the Apostolic See.³ They also reminded him of Innocent's judgement as to the small value of the acquittal of Pelagius⁴; and respectfully intimated that not they but he had been guilty of a hasty credulity. He had taken Caelestius too easily at his own valuation, and had failed to examine his language closely. Finally, they begged to forward authentic accounts of all their proceedings⁵; and entrusted them, along with their own two letters, to the sub-deacon Marcellinus, who also was the bearer of the memorial of Paulinus.⁶

§ 10. The correspondence had no sooner arrived in Rome than Zosimus found it necessary to retrace his steps. By *Quamvis patrum*,⁷ of 21 March 418, he replied to the Africans, in a letter remarkable alike for its grandiloquent language as to the authority of his See, and for its practical surrender. 'So great is our

21 March 418 (Zos. *Ep.* xii [*P. L.* xx. 676 sq.] or Aug. *Op.* x, app. 104 sq. [*P. L.* xlv. 1725 sq.]; Jaffé, No. 342), and *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 5 (*Op.* x. 433 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 573 sq.).

¹ *De pecc. orig.*, §§ 8, 9 (*Op.* x. 256; *P. L.* xlv. 389).

² Prosper, *Contra Collat.* v, § 3 (*Op.* 320; *P. L.* li. 227 c); Aug. *Op.* x, app. 102 D, E (*P. L.* xlv. 1723 sq.), and Document No. 129.

³ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 5 (*Op.* x. 434 c, d; *P. L.* xlv. 574).

⁴ *De pecc. orig.*, § 9 (*Op.* x. 256 f; *P. L.* xlv. 389).

⁵ Marius Merc. *Comm.* i, § 5 (*P. L.* xlviii. 77).

⁶ *Paulini Libellus*, § 4 (*Op.* x, app. 104 B [*P. L.* xlv. 1725]).

⁷ Zos. *Ep.* xii. (*P. L.* xx. 676-8); Aug. *Op.* x, app. 104 (*P. L.* xlv. 1725 sq.); *Coll. Avell.*, No. 50 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 115); Jaffé, No. 342.

authority,' § 1, he writes, 'that no decision of ours can be subjected to review. It was for that very reason that we were anxious to carry you with us by consulting you at every step in regard to Caelestius: but, on reading what you have sent us by Marcellinus, § 2, we quite admit the need for deliberation, and we need only assure you that we have taken no final step and that things are as they were in the days of Pope Innocent.' It was an attempt to retreat with flying colours; like James I who, in retiring beaten from the House of Commons, always flourished his sovereign rights. But the Africans had no further interest in the proceedings of Zosimus: they were busy at Court instead. They got at Honorius, as the Pelagians alleged, by bribes¹; but more probably by making influence with his sister, Galla Placidia. By *Ad conturbendam*,² a rescript addressed, 30 April 418, to Palladius, the Praetorian Prefect in Italy, the Emperor recites that it has come to 'the ears of our Clemency', § 1, how, by the false doctrine of Pelagius and Caelestius, the tranquillity of Rome and other places has been disturbed. They are, therefore, § 2, to be banished from the City; and their followers, on the evidence of any informant, are to be visited with confiscation and exile.

§ 11. We hear little more of Pelagius and Caelestius; but it was also a heavy blow for Pope Zosimus, thus to set the police upon him! Yet it was the way of the Africans; and they were now ready, when the letter of Zosimus reached them, 29 April, to recur, with better hope of success, to theological argument at the Council of Carthage,³ of 1 May 418. All the five provinces of Africa were represented, together with Mauretania Tingitana—the hinterland of Tangier—which then belonged to the civil Diocese of Spain. There were 215 bishops, under the presidency of Aurelius and another. It was a 'plenary Council of the whole of Africa',⁴ according to Augustine; and he himself was the soul of the Council. Its sittings were held in the Secretarium⁵—rather

¹ Aug. *Op. imp.* iii, § 35 (*Op.* x. 1066 A; *P. L.* xlv. 1262).

² Aug. *Op.* x, app. 105 sq. (*P. L.* xlv. 1727), and Document No. 133. The rescript was probably obtained by Aurelius: see an Imperial letter to him in Leo, *Op.* iii. 174 (*P. L.* lvi. 493), and the title to the rescript as found in ib. iii. 170 (*P. L.* lvi. 490); Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 237, n. 3.

³ Aug. *Op.* x, app. 106–8 (*P. L.* xlv. 1728–30); P. Quesnel [1634–†1719], *ap. Leo*, *Op.* iii. 165 sqq. (*P. L.* lvi. 486–90); Mansi, iii. 810–23, iv. 377 sq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 190–6 (E. Tr. ii. 458 sqq.); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 738 sqq.; Fleury, xxiii. xlviii.

⁴ *Ep.* cccv, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 794 c; *P. L.* xxxiii. 972).

⁵ J. Bingham, *Ant.* viii. vii, §§ 1, 7, and Newman's note in Fleury, ii. 319, note f.

more than sacristy—of the basilica of Faustus ; and in nine canons it proceeded to lay down, under anathema, the Catholic doctrine of Original Sin and the need of grace.¹ No. 1 is directed against the first proposition imputed to Caelestius at Carthage in 412, and condemns those who say that death is not connected with sin.² No. 2 affirms that regeneration is needful for those who, as infants, have done no sin but, as human beings, have inherited a taint of sinfulness. On neither side, we may note, was it then maintained that infant baptism was wrong or that it was a mere ceremony—the two positions of the Anabaptists³ and of Zwingli⁴ respectively, in the sixteenth century, and of the spiritual descendants of either, in later days. The canon also put the Pelagians into a corner by asserting that they evacuate the meaning of ‘ baptism for the remission of sins ’ : for baptism, it asserts, is [not for admission to the kingdom of heaven only but] for remission of sins then and there by it conveyed. No. 3 repudiates the doctrine of a ‘ middle place where infants live in happiness who die unbaptized ’, i.e. it condemns the later ‘ limbus infantum ’.⁵ For this reason it has been disputed⁶ ; but, says Duchesne, it is ‘ certainly authentic ’.⁷ No. 4 is aimed at those who say that grace only avails for pardon of past sins, but not for help in the future ; No. 5 at those who admit grace as a help to avoid sin, but take it as merely equivalent to instruction—as if it operates on the intellect only, and not rather on the affections and the will as well ; and No. 6 at those who say grace is only given to make it easier to obey. And Nos. 7-9 deal with strange interpretations foisted by Pelagians on certain texts of Scripture by which ‘ If we say that we have no sin, &c. ’ (1 *John* i. 8), is glossed as a mere expression of humility, and ‘ Forgive us ’—not ‘ me ’—‘ our trespasses ’ as an act of intercession or again of humility. It will be noticed that these nine canons fall into triads : the first three dealing with the relation of mortality to the Fall, the connexion of infant baptism with original sin, and the impossibility of salvation for unbaptized infants ; the next three insisting that grace is more

¹ Document No. 134.

² For modern statements of this connexion, see H. P. Liddon, *Advent Sermons*, i. 78 ; C. Gore, *Romans*, app. E (ii. 232 sq.).

³ B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Cont. Ref.*, No. 210.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 214.

⁵ On the ‘ limbus infantum ’, see St. Thos. Aq., *Summa*, Suppl. lxix, arts. 7 and 8 ; and on ‘ the middle place ’, J. B. Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 129.

⁶ Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 191 sq. (E. Tr. ii. 459).

⁷ *Hist. anc.* iii. 236, n. 2.

than forgiveness, more than illumination, and does more than simply facilitate obedience ; the last three asserting that even the holiest persons have in truth sins, for which they must entreat the pardon of God. The necessity for making such an affirmation as this last sheds a lurid light on the mental and moral position of later Pelagians. Other canons were added against Donatism¹; and a special provision, arising out of the case of Apiarius to be considered later on, was made against transmarine appeals.²

§ 12. Blocked as he thus found himself both by Court and Council, Zosimus saw there was nothing for it but to proceed to the condemnation of Pelagianism.³ His attention had lately been called to renewed dissensions in Rome itself on the subject,⁴ and he resolved to retry Caelestius. But Caelestius declined,⁵ and quitted the city.⁶ The Pope then issued his sentence, confirming the decrees of the Council of Carthage in 417, and, in conformity with the judgement of Pope Innocent,⁷ condemning anew both Pelagius and Caelestius. They were to be reduced to the rank of penitents if they abjured their errors,⁸ and if not, to be excommunicate. The sentence was embodied in a lengthy document addressed by the Pope to the bishops of the various countries, under the title of an *Epistola Tractoria*⁹ or Judicial Epistle. It would be interesting to know how Zosimus managed to reconcile his final with his former attitude, and how far he committed himself to the doctrinal system of St. Augustine ; but the *Tractoria*¹⁰ has not come down to us. It is, however, alluded to here and there by Augustine ; and we gather that it exhibited, by

¹ Nos. 9-16 = *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr.* 117-24 (Mansi, iii. 815 sqq. ; Hefele, II. i. 193-5 [E. Tr. ii. 460 sq.]) ; Fleury, xxiii. xlix.

² No. 17 [125] ; Mansi, iii. 822 D ; Hefele, II. i. 195 (E. Tr. ii. 461).

³ Fleury, xxiii. l.

⁴ Referred to in the Rescript of Honorius, Aug. *Op.* x, app. 105 E (*P. L.* xlv. 1727).

⁵ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, § 5 (*Op.* x. 434 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 574).

⁶ Marius Merc. *Comm.* i, § 5 (*P. L.* xlviii. 77 sqq.).

⁷ Aug. *Contra Iulianum*, i, § 13 (*Op.* x. 503 sq. ; *P. L.* xlv. 648).

⁸ *De pecc. orig.*, § 25 (*Op.* x. 263 D ; *P. L.* xlv. 396) ; *Ep. cxc*, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 706 G ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 863).

⁹ Properly a letter of summons ('trahere', sc. by the *Cursus publicus*) as to a Council, e. g. in Constantine's letter to Ablavius, the Vicar of Africa, bidding him summon the bishops to the Council of Arles, 314 (Aug. *Op.* ix, app. 22 C ; *P. L.* xliii. 785). Then it was applied to letters containing the decisions of Councils. Hence = 'judicial' (Aug. *Ep.* xliii, § 8 ; *Op.* ii. 92 B ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 163) or 'synodical'. See fuller note in Marius Merc. *Comm.* iii, § 1 (*P. L.* xlviii. 90 sqq.).

¹⁰ Fragments in Zos. *Epist.* (*P. L.* xx. 693 sq.) ; Aug. *Op.* x, app. 108 sq. (*P. L.* xlv. 1730 sq.) ; Jaffé, No. 393.

quotations from the Commentary of Pelagius on St. Paul, the errors charged against Caelestius; condemned Pelagius' theory of a place of salvation, outside the kingdom of heaven, for infants dying unbaptized¹; insisted on the doctrine of a transmitted sinfulness and as its remedy on baptism, which, moreover, has the same force both for adults and for infants²; and was equally explicit about the need of real grace.³ The Church of Africa thus saved the Roman See from taking up a false position, and rescued Zosimus from the complications of his own impulsive credulousness. Yet there ensued no breach with Augustine: on the contrary, we find the Bishop of Hippo entrusted, in 418, with a special commission from Zosimus in Caesarea Mauretania.⁴ In Rome, too, the situation cleared: for the priest Sixtus (afterwards Pope Sixtus III, 432-†41), who had lent his patronage to friends of Pelagius among the laity,⁵ now came in, and wrote to the bishops of Carthage⁶ and Hippo⁷ to reassure the Africans; and Leo the acolyte, afterwards Pope Leo I, 440-†61, was the bearer of his letter to Aurelius. Everywhere else the *Tractoria* was eventually received with general acceptance; and, in Africa, signatures to it were required by the Government.⁸

¹ Aug. *De anima*, ii, § 17 (*Op.* x. 367 A; *P. L.* xlv. 505).

² *Ep.* cxc, § 23 (*Op.* ii. 707 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 865).

³ Zos. *Fr.* II (*P. L.* xx. 693).

⁴ *Ep.* cxc, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 700 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 857); Fleury, xxiii. lv.

⁵ *Ep.* exci, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 709 C; *P. L.* xxxiii. 867); Fleury, xxiii. lvi.

⁶ *Ibid.* (709 B).

⁷ *Ep.* exciv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 715 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 874).

⁸ 'Dissertatio de const. Imp. in causa Pelagii,' III, IV, *ap.* Marius Merc. xlviii. 394 sqq., 400 sqq., or Coll. Quesnell. xvi, xvii, *ap.* Leo, *Op.* iii (*P. L.* lvi. 493 sqq.).

CHAPTER VII

THE OVERTHROW OF PELAGIANISM, 418-31.

ONLY nineteen bishops of Italy held out.¹ They were headed by Julian, bishop of Eclanum, 417-†54. He now became the chief opponent of Augustine in what may be called the aftermath of the Pelagian controversy proper, i.e. in the struggle between Augustinianism and semi-Pelagianism.

§ 1. While Julian's opposition was developing, and the news of the condemnation of Pelagius had not yet reached Palestine, Augustine was informed, by some friends of his there, that they had some reason to think Pelagius a much-maligned man. The friends were the Roman exiles Pinian, his wife Melania, and her mother Albina.² We last heard of them at Hippo; but they had now been resident, for a year or two, in Palestine.³ Here they had a conversation with Pelagius, and begged him to condemn in writing the opinions alleged against him. He assured them that he believed Grace to be 'necessary not only at all hours and in every moment, but also in every action',⁴ and 'infants to receive baptism for the remission of sins'.⁵ He read to them his *Libellus Fidei* intended for Pope Innocent⁶; and he tried to separate his case from that of Caelestius. No doubt he had been included with Caelestius in common condemnation by Innocent and the Africans; but he, at any rate, had been acquitted at Diospolis.⁷ Pinian and his women-folk were naturally pleased with this disclaimer. But, though sympathetic, they were a little suspicious; and they wrote to Augustine to inquire what it was worth. Augustine replied in two treatises of 418, in order to expose its disingenuousness.

§ 2. Of these, the first is the *De gratia Christi*.⁸ Here he begins,

¹ For their refusal, see Aug. *Contra duas epp. Pel.* i, § 3 (*Op.* x. 412 c; *P. L.* xlv. 551), and, for their memorial, Marius Mercator (*P. L.* xlviii. 509-26).

² *De grat. Chr.*, § 1 (*Op.* x. 229 A; *P. L.* xlv. 359).

³ They salute Augustine in Jerome, *Ep.* cxliii, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 1068; *P. L.* xxii. 1182).

⁴ *De grat. Chr.*, § 2 (*Op.* x. 229 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 360 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 35 (*Op.* x. 245 E; *P. L.* xlv. 377).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 32 and *De pecc. orig.*, § 1 (*Op.* x. 244, 253; *P. L.* xlv. 376, 385).

⁷ *De pecc. orig.*, § 9 (*Op.* x. 256 D; *P. L.* xlv. 389).

⁸ *Op.* x. 229-52 (*P. L.* xlv. 359-86); Fleury, xxiii. liii.

§ 2, by showing the illusory and ambiguous character of the language customary with Pelagius ; but, § 3, one passage quoted from his *Pro libero arbitrio*, to which he referred Pope Innocent in the *Libellus Fidei*, is, §§ 4, 5, explicit enough. It shows, §§ 6, 7, that he only acknowledged Grace in regard to the possibility¹ (*posse*) of choosing good or evil ; not in respect of willing (*velle*) or being (*esse*) the one or the other.² He confines its function to that of assisting 'the natural possibility' of choice³—a phrase which 'supposes a foundation of independent power in the will to which grace is an addition'.⁴ But even such assistance, § 8, consists only in 'instruction and revelation'. It may, §§ 9–13, teach us what we ought to do, but it does not help us to do it. Further on, he comes to a cardinal point. Contrasting, §§ 23, 24, a passage from the letter of Pelagius to Demetrias with one of his disclaimers at Diospolis, he shows that, according to him, grace is given in payment for merit ; and therefore it is not really grace. Pelagius is really, § 26, 'a proud assertor of the freedom of the will'. Nor, § 30, is that grace which is given merely to make obedience easier. In no one passage, in fact, § 31, do Pelagius and Caelestius come up to the required mark of acknowledging grace in the proper sense of a supernatural aid to the will, consisting, § 38, in the infusion of love.⁵ Pelagius may speak, §§ 42–4, of grace as consisting in 'the example of Christ' ; but that is only to lend a more Christian colour to his theory, and to give naturalism a rosier hue ; and, §§ 47–51, Pelagius can certainly not shelter himself under the credit of Ambrose.

§ 3. In the next book Augustine treats *De peccato originali*,⁶ and starts by pointing out, § 1, the inconsistency of admitting that infants are baptized for remission of sins, and, at the same time, maintaining that we are not affected at birth by the sin of our first parents. Certainly it was, § 2, Caelestius who was most explicit in denial of original sin, whether, §§ 3–4, at Carthage, 412, or, §§ 5–6, before Pope Zosimus ; though Augustine, §§ 7–10,

¹ As in §§ 2, 5, 40, 43, 45, 52.

² An important passage which contains, as Augustine says, 'totum dogma Pelagii', § 6, and Document No. 130.

³ *De grat. Chr.*, § 17 (*Op.* x. 238 B. C ; *P. L.* xliv. 369).

⁴ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 55.

⁵ As to 'the nature or quality of . . . grace in itself . . . as distinguished from its effects . . . Augustine identifies [it] with the disposition of love', Mozley, 183.

⁶ *Op.* x. 253–76 (*P. L.* xliv. 383–410).

somewhat glosses over the proceedings of Zosimus ; but, §§ 11–13, as is clear from the proceedings at Diospolis, there is little to choose between disciple and master save that, where the one was frank, the other was diplomatic.¹ A single passage,² § 14, in the recent book of Pelagius, *Pro libero arbitrio*, is quite enough to show with how little sincerity he had, at that Council, anathematized those who held that the sin of Adam harmed himself alone and that infants are born in the same state in which Adam was before the Fall. The truth is, § 15, he stole absolution there ; and, § 16, to say, as he does, that the sin of Adam injured his descendants not through heredity but because they all have imitated his bad example,³ shows that it was only by tricking his judges that he secured it. Be sure then, § 18, that ‘ Councils of bishops, the Apostolic See, the entire Roman Church, and the Roman Empire which, by the grace of God, is Christian ’ have been right in bestirring themselves against Caelestius and Pelagius.⁴ The latter, §§ 19–24, tried to trick the Apostolic See in the matter of the necessity of baptism for infants ; but, in the end, in vain. For, § 25, both he and his disciple were condemned. And rightly. Pelagianism, §§ 26–8, is not, as its authors contend, an open question ; it militates against primary redemptive truth, since it involves the question whether Christ be truly the Mediator of all men : and that, as the Second Adam in Whom, along with the first Adam, the Christian Faith properly consists.⁵ The grace of the Mediator, §§ 29, 30, is a much more potent instrument of salvation than the Law which preceded it ; but, §§ 30, 31, we are not to distinguish three epochs, as Pelagius does, and say that the just lived at first under Nature, then under the Law, and at last under Grace. As if the first were saved by Nature only, the second by the Law, while Grace was not necessary till after the coming of Christ ! His Grace extends backward as well as forward⁶ ; and the just men of the Old Covenant owe their salvation to it. To

¹ *De pecc. orig.*, § 13.

² *Ibid.*, § 14, Document No. 131, an explicit denial of original sin, quoted *verbatim* from Pelagius.

³ ‘ Non propagine sed exemplo,’ *ibid.*, § 16.

⁴ It was not therefore the Roman See alone that settled the matter, as is implied in the misquotation, ‘ Roma locuta est ; causa finita est,’ *supra*.

⁵ ‘ In horum ergo duorum hominum causa proprie fides Christiana consistit,’ *ibid.*, § 28.

⁶ The argument is that of Keble’s poem for the Feast of the Circumcision, in *The Christian Year*, ‘ Now of thy love,’ &c. ; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xliii.

deny, therefore, § 34, that what the first Adam had ruined can be restored only in the Second Adam, is to offend against the Rule of Faith. Lastly, § 38, there is the Pelagian objection to Original Sin on the ground that it makes marriage an evil thing ; and man, who is the fruit of marriage, no longer the work of God. But marriage is in itself good, § 39, ' It was ordained '—to borrow from the Prayer Book paraphrase of Augustine's language at this point—' for the procreation of children, for a remedy against sin, and for the mutual society, help and comfort that the one ought to have of the other.'¹ Whatever it may have of shameful, even in its lawful use, § 42, is to be put down not to the original nature created good, but to the corruption which that nature subsequently received.

Such, then, was the reply of Augustine to Pinian ; and, with the two books in which it was contained, he sent him all the acts of the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius both in Africa and at Rome.²

§ 4. About the same time he wrote the letter to Sixtus,³ toward the end of 418. Theologically, it was one of the most momentous of all Augustine's letters ; for it elaborated those extreme positions of Augustinianism which provided the cause—and, in a measure, the justification—of Julian and semi-Pelagianism.

' I am glad to hear,' § 1, he tells the future Pope Sixtus III, 432-†40, ' that you have turned your back on your Pelagian friends, and, § 2, I take the opportunity, afforded me by the return of your messenger, of sending you a few points to use in dealing with their objections.' First, § 3, they are under the impression that we are deprived of free-will if we admit that, without the help of God, we have not even a good will. But the first movement toward good in the will is from God.⁴ Secondly, § 4, they think that to say that God, apart from any antecedent merits, ' has mercy on whom He will ', is to make Him a respecter of persons. But if he who has sinned receives a merited condemnation and he who is pardoned an unmerited grace, the one has no cause for complaint nor the other for boasting ; and this is precisely a case where there is no respect of persons, when all were involved in one

¹ ' Fides, proles, sacramentum,' is a summary of §§ 39, 42, and occurs in Aug. *De gen. ad litt.* ix, § 12 (*Op.* III. i. 247 D ; *P. L.* xxxiv. 397).

² *Ibid.*, § 8.

³ *Ep.* cxciv (*Op.* ii. 715-30 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 874-91) ; Fleury, xxiii. lvii.

⁴ ' Paratur enim voluntas a Domino,' *ibid.*, § 5.

common mass of condemnation. Thirdly, §§ 5, 6, they say that it is unjust, when both are in one and the same evil case, to pardon one and punish another. It is, however, undoubtedly just to punish both. Our part is to thank God that He has not treated us like our fellows. If all were saved, the just retribution due to sin would escape attention ; if none, the benefit of grace would pass equally unnoticed. We must, then, seek for the cause of any apparent unfairness, not in difference of merit, or the like, but simply, with St. Paul (*Rom.* xi. 33–6), in the inscrutable depths of the Divine Wisdom. But, fourthly, § 7, Pelagius himself, at the Council of Diospolis, had seemed to condemn the error that grace was given according to merits ; and, § 8, his disciples now hold that, when he there admitted that grace was given without reference to previous merit, the grace he meant was that human nature of ours in which we were born without having deserved it. Let no Christian be under any such illusion : when St. Paul commends grace, he means not that by which we were created men but that by which we were justified when we were bad men ; and the argument then goes on, §§ 10–13, to expose other instances in which Pelagius accepts grace in an inadequate sense, e.g. as remission of sins. Fifthly, §§ 22–3, ‘ Men well excuse themselves ’, says the Pelagian, ‘ by asking, “ Why should we be blamed if we live ill, since we have not received grace to live well ? ” ’ Augustine answers that they who live ill cannot truly say they are not to blame ; for, if men do no ill, they live well. But, if they live ill, it proceeds from themselves : either from the evil they brought with them at their birth or from the evil they added themselves. If, then, they are vessels of wrath, made for perdition, which is their due, let them put it down to themselves as being formed of that lump which God has justly condemned for the sin of that one man in whom all have sinned ; if they are vessels of mercy, to His unmerited Grace. ‘ Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God ? ’ But, sixthly, § 31, it is objected that this is, once more, to ascribe to God respect of persons, or injustice. Take, then, the case of infants. The Pelagians—forced to it whether by the plain words of the Gospel or by the practice of the Church—admit that no infant, except he be ‘ born again of water and Spirit ’, can enter into the kingdom of heaven. One such infant dies after baptism, another still unbaptized : where does respect of persons come in here ? What merits, §§ 32–3, have preceded ? None in the infants

themselves : they are drawn from the same mass. None in the parents : for often it is the child of Christian parents that dies unbaptized, while the child which has been baptized is one who has been exposed by heathen parents, and picked up and brought to the font by some good Christian. In the case, §§ 34, 35, of Esau and Jacob, St. Paul said nothing of foreseen merits. Even though one should say that God foresees their works, § 41, it is ridiculous to say that God foresees the future works of those who are to die in infancy. You cannot speak of those as future works which are never to be done at all. But, in the seventh place, §§ 42, 43, it may be said by the Pelagians that foreseen demerits, at any rate, may be the reason why God punishes some infants by letting them die unbaptized. What, then, becomes of the Pelagian assertion that children dying unbaptized do not go to the place of punishment ? Eighth, § 44, comes an objection against original sin—‘ How can parents pass on to their children what was confessedly forgiven when they were themselves baptized ? ’ It is a mere cavil. Nor, § 45, is there much more in the ninth objection drawn from the answer given for infants by their sponsors that they ‘ believe in the remission of sins ’. ‘ Yes,’ is the Pelagian gloss : ‘ remission to those who have any.’ ‘ Why then ’, replies Augustine, § 45, ‘ does every infant receive Exorcism and Exsufflation ? These rites ¹ are but a mockery, if the child is not in the power of the devil.’ And he ends his long letter by begging Sixtus to let him know if he hears of any other objections to the Catholic Faith, and what answers are customarily given in Rome.

It was a disastrous document ; coming, as it did, from a Doctor with so great a name as Augustine. Eight or nine years later it furnished the occasion to two uncompromising treatises, 426–7, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* ² and *De correptione et gratia* ³ ; and so to semi-Pelagianism, of which these were the prelude : while it now reaffirmed that tenet of predestinarianism which, eleven years earlier, had made its first appearance in Augustine’s writings with two books of 397, addressed to Simplicianus, ⁴ bishop of Milan 397–†400. According to this doctrine, ⁵ the ‘ mass ’—a word taken

¹ For these rites, see Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 296 ; T. Thompson, *The offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, 111, 125, 167, 239.

² *Op.* x. 717–44 (*P. L.* xliv. 881–912).

³ *Op.* x. 749–78 (*P. L.* xliv. 915–46).

⁴ *De div. quaest. ad Simpl.* i. ii, § 16 (*Op.* vi. 96 sq. ; *P. L.* xl. 120 sq.).

⁵ For typical statements of it, see *De div. quaest. ad Simpl.* [A. D. 397], i. ii, § 13 (*Op.* vi. 95 ; *P. L.* xl. 118) ; *De nat. et gr.* [A. D. 415], §§ 4, 5 (*Op.*

from a Latin version of *Rom.* ix. 21—or ‘lump’ of the children of Adam is ‘a mass of perdition’¹ or ‘condemnation’.² By a divine decree, irrespective of any foreseen goodness in the one part or evil in the other, God separated one portion of mankind from the rest, ordaining the one to eternal life and the other to eternal punishment. If it be asked where the justice of such predestination and reprobation³ comes in, it is, of course, an inscrutable mystery. ‘The law of God’s *secret* justice rests with Him alone.’⁴ But it is to ‘the mass of perdition’ that we are referred for its defence. ‘Had mankind’, as Dr. Mozley expounds St. Augustine, ‘continued in the state in which they were originally created, the consignment of any portion of them, antecedently to all action, to eternal punishment, would have been unjust. But all mankind having fallen from that state by their sin in Adam, and become one guilty mass, eternal punishment is antecedently due to all; and therefore none have any right to complain if they are consigned antecedently to it; while those who are spared should thank God’s gratuitous mercy.’⁵ The theory is an instance of Augustine’s one-sided and remorseless logic. Scripture, it is true, makes predestinarian statements; but there are passages, as plain, in the opposite direction. These, on the contrary, Augustine explains away. Thus he glosses the natural force of the text that ‘God willeth all men to be saved’⁶ by taking ‘all’ to mean not

x. 129; *P. L.* xliv. 249 sq.); *Ep.* clxxxvi [A. D. 417], §§ 25, 26 (*Op.* ii. 671 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 825); *Contra duas epp. Pel.* [A. D. 420], ii, § 15 (*Op.* x. 440 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 581 sq.); *Enchiridion* [A. D. 421], § 25 (*Op.* vi. 232 sq.; *P. L.* xl. 277 sqq.); *Tract. in Ioann.* xlvii (*Op.* iii. 606 sqq.; *P. L.* xxxv. 1732 sqq.); *De Civitate Dei* [A. D. 413–26], xxii. xxiv, § 5 (*Op.* vii. 692 A; *P. L.* xli. 791 sq.); *Contra Iulianum* [A. D. 421], v, § 14 (*Op.* x. 635 sqq.; *P. L.* xlv. 792); and specially developed in *De corrept. et grat.* [A. D. 426–7], §§ 13–16 (*Op.* x. 757 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 924 sq.), and in [428–9] *De praed. sanct.* and *De don. pers.*, esp. the latter, § 35 (*Op.* x. 839 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 1014), and Document No. 188. See also Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.*, c. v.

¹ ‘Massa perditionis’, *De corrept. et grat.*, § 16 (*Op.* x. 758 E; *P. L.* xlv. 925); *De don. pers.*, § 35 (*Op.* x. 839 G; *P. L.* xlv. 1014); *Contra Iul.* v, § 14 (*Op.* x. 636 C; *P. L.* xlv. 792).

² ‘Massa damnationis’, *Ep.* cxciv, § 4 (*Op.* ii. 716 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 875).

³ Augustine, and not only Calvin, teaches a double predestination, e. g. ‘Praedestinatum ad interitum’, *De perf. iust.*, § 31 (*Op.* x. 181 E; *P. L.* xlv. 308); ‘Damnandi praedestinati’, *De pecc. merit.* ii, § 26 (*Op.* x. 54 F; *P. L.* xlv. 167); and ‘Quos praedestinavit ad aeternam mortem’, *De anima*, iv, § 16 (*Op.* x. 395 G; *P. L.* xlv. 533), i. e. Reprobation, not mere Dereliction.

⁴ *De pecc. merit.* ii, § 32 (*Op.* x. 57 A; *P. L.* xlv. 170); *Quaest. ad Simpl.* i. ii, § 16 (*Op.* vi. 97; *P. L.* xl. 121).

⁵ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 150.

⁶ 1 Tim. ii. 4.

‘all men’ but ‘some men out of all classes and ranks of men’.¹ The rest, that are suggestive of predestination, he takes and erects into a system scarcely less absolute than that of Calvin; for, though there is a gap between the Saint and the Reformer,² it would not be well to make too much of it.³ Augustine overpassed the truth in two directions. First, he asserted the transmission not merely of sinful propensities but of a personal sin: i.e. he held that Adam’s sin was by actual imputation the personal sin of each and all.⁴ God therefore must have condemned all; but if He, for an inscrutable reason, chooses to elect some to life, He is not unjust, for He does but abandon the rest to their deserved doom. Next, he asserted, as an inevitable consequence of absolute predestination, that grace is irresistible⁵; where the end is assured, the means must be as certain of their effect. But it is the pitilessness rather than the logic of the system that appals us. We must bear in mind, then, that in a barbarous age like Augustine’s—when, for example, the exposure of children⁶ was a thing of everyday occurrence—no sentiment of humanity would have been there to make him shudder at its extreme rigour. Chrysostom, it will be remembered, could not conceive of eternal punishment except as eternal torment, for torture was an everyday incident

¹ *Enchiridion*, § 27 (*Op.* vi. 235; *P. L.* xl. 280).

² On the difference between them, see D. Petavius, S. J. [1583–†1652], *De Theol. Dogm.* x, cc. vi–ix (*Op.* i. 689–704; Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1644).

³ Mozley sees little difference, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 284, n. 3, and note xxi, 413 sqq.; but his reviewer sees more, in *Christian Remembrancer*, xxxi. 171 sqq. (July 1856): see also C. Hardwick, *Articles*, 161 sq.; W. Bright, *Lessons*, 178 sq.; and A. M. Fairbairn in *Cambr. Mod. Hist.* ii. 365. Augustine’s predestinarianism was modified by his acceptance of the Church and the Sacraments; whereas ‘Calvin, finding sacramentalism logically incompatible with his view of “the decrees”, invented a new theory of sacraments which reduced them from channels or means of grace to seals of a grace otherwise bestowed on the elect’, W. Bright, *Lessons*, &c., 180, n. 1. Christian sacraments were thus lowered to the level of Jewish ordinances, W. Bright, *St. Leo* ², 187.

⁴ He relied on *in quo* of Rom. v. 12 as in *Ep.* exciv, § 22 (*Op.* ii. 722 A; *P. L.* xxxiii. 882). For the interpretation he put upon it, see *Contra Iul.* i, § 20 (*Op.* x. 508 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 654). Julian, who knew Greek, whereas A. was a poor Greek scholar, corrected *in quo* for *propter quod* (ἐφ’ ᾧ), *ibid.* vi, § 75 (*Op.* x. 705 c; *P. L.* xlv. 808 sq.); W. Bright, *Lessons*, 174, n. 1.

⁵ Adam simply had ‘adiutorium sine quo non fit’; but we need more, and the grace we have is ‘adiutorium quo fit’, i. e. an assistance which, once given, inevitably produces the effect intended, *De corrept. et grat.*, § 34 (*Op.* x. 769 c; *P. L.* xlv. 957); Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 163–8; W. Bright, *Lessons*, 175 sq. Such grace, in later phrase, was called ‘Indefectible Grace’.

⁶ *Ep.* exciv, § 32 (*Op.* ii. 725 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 886).

in the courts of law. At the end of 418 it looked as if this ruthless system was shortly to become dominant.

§ 5. There arose, to take the field against it, Julian,¹ bishop of Eclanum 417–†54. He was born about 386; the son of a bishop named Memor,² and his wife Juliana.³ Baptized in infancy⁴ and ordained Reader,⁵ he married, while still young, a lady of rank named Ia. Their *epithalamium*⁶ was written by Paulinus of Nola, who had some connexion with the family: while Memor was also well known to Augustine.⁷ Ia, it would seem, died shortly after their marriage; for, 408–9, Julian was already a Deacon. So it appears from a letter of that year from Augustine to his father; where Augustine sends greetings to the ‘youth’ as his ‘son and fellow-deacon’,⁸ and asks him to ‘come and stay’. Innocent I must also have had a good opinion of him, for one of his last acts was to consecrate him, when little more than thirty, bishop of Eclanum in Campania.⁹ But after Innocent’s death Julian declared himself; and, in spite of the intimacy of his family with Augustine, he made no scruple of taking the lead against him, and paid no deference to his age and authority.¹⁰ He was a cultivated man, of quick wits, learned in the Scriptures, and master of Greek as well as Latin.¹¹ Not an ascetic, like Pelagius, he would be the more able to rally the ordinary man to his side. Not a mystic, like Augustine, he could use the Aristotelian dialectic¹² against him as if it represented the last word in everything. Tenacious and irrepressible, he seemed to Augustine an ‘exceedingly forward young man’,¹³ ‘loquacious in discussion, abusive in controversy, and false in profession.’¹⁴ He, in his turn, would be convinced that the anti-Pelagian movement, now victorious in the West, was

¹ See ‘De Iuliano et eius scriptis’ in Aug. *Op.* x. 865–72 (*P. L.* xlv. 1035–48); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 814–23; Fleury, xxiii. li.

² *Ep. ci* (*Op.* ii. 271 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 367 sqq.).

³ Marius Merc. *Liber subn. in scr. Iul.* iv, § 4 (*P. L.* xlviii. 130 sq.).

⁴ *Contra Iul.* i, § 14 (*Op.* x. 504 D; *P. L.* xlv. 649).

⁵ Paulinus, *Carmen*, xxv. 144 (*Op.* 604; *P. L.* lxi. 636).

⁶ Paulinus, *Carmen*, xxv (*Op.* 601–8; *P. L.* lxi. 633–8).

⁷ *Contra Iul.* i, § 12 (*Op.* x. 503 B; *P. L.* xlv. 647).

⁸ *Ep. ci* [A. D. 408], § 4 (*Op.* ii. 272 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 369).

⁹ Marius Merc. *Comm.* iii, § 2 (*P. L.* xlviii. 96).

¹⁰ *Contra Iul.* iii, § 1, v, § 3 (*Op.* x. 552 F, 627 D; *P. L.* xlv. 701, 783).

¹¹ Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, § 46 (*P. L.* lviii. 1084).

¹² *Contra Iul.* i, § 12, ii, § 37, iii, § 7 (*Op.* x. 503 C, 551 C, 556 A; *P. L.* xlv. 647, 700, 705).

¹³ *Ibid.* ii, § 30 (*Op.* x. 545 F; *P. L.* xlv. 694).

¹⁴ *Op. imp.* iv, § 50 (*Op.* x. 1163 C; *P. L.* xlv. 1368 sq.); for his loquacity, see also *Contra Iul.* ii, § 16 (*Op.* x. 537 D; *P. L.* xlv. 685).

fatal to belief both in the equity of God and in the responsibility of man; and, moreover, represented a crude form of pietism, from which he must rescue Christianity at all costs, if it was to keep hold of cultivated people.¹ We find him, therefore, in conflict: first, with Zosimus, 417-†18; then with Augustine; and finally with Pope Boniface, 418-†22.

§ 6. The *Tractoria* of Zosimus was sent to the principal churches of Christendom: in the East to Antioch, Egypt, Constantinople, Thessalonica, Jerusalem²; in the Western Empire to Africa³ and to the various metropolitans. The Court of Ravenna required all bishops to sign the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius; and we have still the letter which Honorius addressed to archbishop Aurelius,⁴ and that in which Aurelius passed on the Imperial Orders to his subordinates.⁵ No one refused in Africa. But in Italy it was different. The injunctions of another Augustine, metropolitan of Aquileia, 407-†34, provoked a refusal from a group of his suffragans and their clergy. They declined to condemn the absent; and, as to doctrine, they put in a memorial which, whether rightly or not attributed to Julian, in all probability expresses his mind. This *Libellus fidei*⁶ begins, in Part I, as did that of Pelagius, by stating the Creed—‘We believe in God, the Father, almighty, &c.’—but is less evasive than his on the points really at issue. Thus the memorialists acknowledge, in Part II, § 1, ‘the grace of Christ’ as co-operating with free-will. It is ‘the perpetual helper and companion of all good acts’. But, § 2, it ‘will not follow those who refuse it’: and, § 3, ‘if one man is good and another bad, the difference is due to fault of ours and not to the will of God’. They assert, Part III, that, § 18, grace is necessary; so, § 19, is baptism, which should be administered to infants in the same words as to adults. But they deny [II, § 11] Original Sin, which they term ‘natural sin, or whatever else you like to call it’, so as to affix to the Augustinian doctrine the imputation of a covert [III, § 17] Manichaeism. And they quote

¹ For his scorn of Catholics as uneducated and stupid, see *Contra Iul.* ii, § 37, iv, § 4 (*Op.* x. 551, 627 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 700, 783 sq.) and *Contra duas epp. Pel.* iv, § 20 (*Op.* x. 480; *P. L.* xlv. 623).

² Marius Merc. *Comm.* i, § 5 (*P. L.* xlviii. 81 sqq.).

³ Prosper, *Contra Collat.*, § 5 (*Op.* 320; *P. L.* li. 228).

⁴ *Dudum quidem* of 9 Jan. 419 (*Aug. Op.* x, app. 109 D; *P. L.* xlv. 1731).

⁵ Of 1 Aug. 419 (*Aug. Op.* x, app. 109 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 1731 sq.).

⁶ *Aug. Op.* x, app. 110-13 (*P. L.* xlv. 1732-6); Marius Merc. *Op.* i, app. ii (*P. L.* xlviii. 509-26) [the references in the text are to M. M.]; Fleury, xxiii. li.

Chrysostom in their support, as denying, Part IV, § 11, that infants brought to baptism are 'stained with sins': an irrelevant quotation, for Chrysostom by 'sins' means 'actual sins'. But they went so far in the way of concession as to admit a proposition which Caelestius had been condemned for ignoring, viz. [III, § 21] 'that the whole human race died in Adam and has been raised again in Christ'. Their memorial is thus a frank improvement upon the original Pelagianism, and they contend that their position [IV, § 2] is in accordance with 'the Catholic Rule' of Faith. If anything further is to be said, they are willing to be corrected; if not, the case should be referred to a General Council.¹ Pelagius and Caelestius had put in their memorials, and so claimed to be Catholics. They would therefore give them the benefit of the doubt and [IV, § 8] neither condemn them unheard nor defend them in their absence. [§ 9] 'Let your Holiness rest assured that widely as the flood may now rage against us, it will never be able to shake the house that is built on the righteousness of Christ.' Julian also wrote two letters to Zosimus.² One of them is lost; but it would seem that in it he identified himself with the position of the memorialists, for Zosimus is said to have condemned him³ as well as the authors of the remonstrance. In the second, preserved for us in fragments by Marius Mercator,⁴ Julian and his friends repudiated three propositions usually attributed to Pelagius and Caelestius: that mankind did not die in Adam nor rise again in Christ, that infants are born in Adam's unfallen condition, and that Adam was created mortal and would have died in any case. The letter was carefully 'circulated all over Italy', and shown about by Julian's friends as 'an entirely admirable production'.⁵ But to no effect, so far as the personal fortunes of Julian and eighteen bishops of his party⁶ were concerned. Excommunicated and deprived by the Pope, they were also banished by the Emperor. Nothing daunted,⁷ in 418, they tried to make interest at Ravenna for a new hearing before a General Council;

¹ For the reply to this demand, see Aug. *Contra duas epp. Pel.* iv, § 34 (*Op.* x. 492 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 637).

² *Op. imp.* i, § 18 (*Op.* x. 880 F; *P. L.* xlv. 1057).

³ *Contra Iulianum*, i, § 13 (*Op.* x. 504 A; *P. L.* xlv. 648).

⁴ *Liber subn. in verba Iul.* vi, §§ 10-13 (*P. L.* xlviii. 140-3); and Aug. *Op.* x, app. 115 sq. (*P. L.* xlv. 1738 sq.).

⁵ Marius Merc. *Liber subn.* vi, § 10 (*P. L.* xlviii. 140 sq.).

⁶ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* i, § 3 (*Op.* x. 412 c; *P. L.* xlv. 551).

⁷ Marius Merc. *Comm. super nom. Caelest.* iii, § 1 (*P. L.* xlviii. 90 sqq.).

and Zosimus, 3 October, had to write and warn some clerics of his at Court to checkmate their machinations.¹ But the Count Valerius, a devout² and studious³ official, of anti-Pelagian sympathies, prevented them gaining the ear of Honorius.⁴ Julian, with his friends, accepted the inevitable. He tried, indeed, but without success, to obtain the sympathy of Rufus,⁵ bishop of Thessalonica 410–†31: then, as they journeyed eastwards, he sought the interest of Atticus⁶ of Constantinople, 406–†26; but all in vain. At Alexandria,⁷ at Antioch, and at Jerusalem he found the doors closed against him. Only Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia 393–†428, showed him any countenance.⁸ He was really of one mind with the Pelagians; and with him the exiles found a refuge, about 423.⁹ Some of them rallied to the Church; but before he reached the safe retreat of Mopsuestia, Julian had made up his mind that the future was his. He was the Athanasius of his day¹⁰; certain of ultimate triumph, let Councils, Popes, and Emperors be all against him; the champion of a faithful minority, engaged in righteous protest against a powerful and fashionable error.

§ 7. In this conviction, and with the knowledge that he had nothing to lose, he hailed the opportunity of crossing swords with Augustine, 419. Count Valerius had seen a Pelagian statement that Augustine implicitly condemned marriage as a medium of the transmission of sin. The Count was a man of robust faith, and laughed at this calumny. But he was in correspondence with Augustine, and may have mentioned the charge. Augustine, at any rate, felt bound to answer it, and addressed to Valerius, early in 419, the first book of his *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*. He recognizes, § 5, the honourableness of the married estate; and explains that, §§ 12, 13, while concupiscence is not inherent in marriage nor derived from its first institution, it came in, § 19,

¹ Zos. *Ep.* xiv. (*P. L.* xx. 679 sq.); Jaffé, No. 345.

² Aug. *Ep.* cc (*Op.* ii. 761 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 925 sq.).

³ Aug. *De nuptiis*, i, § 40 (*Op.* x. 300 D; *P. L.* xlv. 436).

⁴ Ibid. i, § 2 (*Op.* x. 281 A; *P. L.* xlviii. 413).

⁵ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* i, § 3, ii, § 1 (*Op.* x. 412 C, 431 A; *P. L.* xlv. 551; 571).

⁶ Caelestine, *Ep.* xiii, § 1 (*P. L.* l. 469 B); Jaffé, No. 374; Aug. *Op.* x, app. 130 D (*P. L.* xlv. 1755).

⁷ *Coll. Avell.*, No. 49 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 113–15); Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 264, n. 3.

⁸ Marius Merc. *Praef. in Symb. Theod.*, § 2 (*P. L.* xlviii. 215 A).

⁹ Ibid., note a. ¹⁰ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* i, § 75 (*Op.* x. 919; *P. L.* xlv. 1100).

accidentally by the sin of the first man.¹ Fecundity and sex, § 23, are good in themselves, since they are the work of the Creator. If anything is shameful, § 24, it proceeds from another cause, i.e. from the strife of the flesh against the Spirit, which is the consequence of sin. The holy estate of matrimony, § 18, makes good use of this evil for the production of mankind. Concupiscence however, §§ 20–22, is the reason why those born in lawful wedlock from the children of God are not born children of God, but subject to the power of the devil till they are freed, as were their parents, by grace. Concupiscence, § 28, remains in the baptized, but not its guilt; and, § 30, that is why they are still inclined to sin. To this Julian replied in ‘four thick books’² addressed to Turbantius,³ which can be recovered, in large part, from Augustine’s rejoinder. Meanwhile, certain extracts were sent to Valerius from the first book of Julian’s four. Valerius sent them on to Augustine, through his and Augustine’s mutual friend Alypius, who had been at Ravenna. To satisfy Valerius, Augustine wrote off a hasty reply⁴ in the second part of the *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*,⁵ of 420. Here he defends the Catholic doctrine of Original Sin, and shows how widely it differs from Manichaeism, with which Julian persisted in identifying it. It is one thing to say that human nature has received a taint; another to assert that its material part is intrinsically evil. But when Julian’s work itself came into Augustine’s hands, he found that the extracts did not agree with the original.⁶ So he published a second and fuller rejoinder in his *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum*⁷ of 422, in six books. The first two are a critique of Julian from i, § 3, the authority of the Catholic Fathers; showing that, §§ 15–20, the East is not less opposed to Pelagianism than the West, and dealing with, ii, § 2, the five arguments of the Pelagians against Original Sin: (a) that it makes the devil the author of human birth; (b) that it condemns marriage; (c) that it denies all sins were remitted in baptism; (d) that it

¹ ‘Proles, fides, sacramentum’ occur again in §§ 13, 19.

² *Contra Iulianum*, i, § 2 (*Op.* x. 498 A; *P. L.* xlv. 642).

³ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* iv, § 30 (*Op.* x. 1149 D; *P. L.* xlv. 1353), from which it appears that, by 430, Turbantius had become a Catholic.

⁴ *Ep.* ccvii (*Op.* ii. 774; *P. L.* xxxiii. 949 sq.); *De nuptiis*, ii, §§ 1, 2 (*Op.* x. 301; *P. L.* xlv. 437); *Praef. in Op. imp.* (*Op.* x. 873 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 1049). Alypius took it to Valerius, *Op. imp.* i, § 7 (*Op.* x. 877 F; *P. L.* xlv. 1053).

⁵ *Op.* x. 301–34 (*P. L.* xlv. 437–74); Fleury, xxiv. xviii.

⁶ *Ep.* ccvii (*Op.* ii. 774 C; *P. L.* xxxiii. 950).

⁷ *Op.* x. 497–710 (*P. L.* xlv. 641–874); Fleury, xxiv. xxiv.

charges God with injustice, and (e) that it makes us despair of perfection. In the remaining four books he takes Julian's four books *seriatim*; reaffirming, unfortunately, some of his own extreme positions, e.g. in what sense 'God willeth all men to be saved',¹ or that from the common mass of perdition some are chosen freely while others are vessels of wrath²; but also restating familiar and telling considerations, e.g. those drawn from the exorcism, exsufflation, and baptism of infants³ in proof of Original Sin. Julian, then in Cilicia, retaliated, c. 424—such was his fertility and volubility as a controversialist—with eight books addressed to Florus, a bishop of his party, against Augustine's second book, *De nuptiis*⁴; and the long-drawn dispute was brought to a close by a treatise of 429–30 which Augustine did not live to finish, and which is therefore known as his *Contra secundam Iuliani responsionem imperfectum opus*.⁵ Six only of the eight books of Julian are here dealt with, section by section. His words are copied down and Augustine's reply appended; so that the greater part of Julian's treatise is extant, and we may judge of the man first-hand.

Julian's controversial methods were verbose, irrelevant, and vulgar. He was 'offensive to those who dislike idle talk and wish to stick to the point'.⁶ He called his opponents names: rarely speaking of Catholics but as Traducianists or Manichaeans,⁷ and deriding Augustine himself as that 'Punic preacher',⁸ 'dullest',⁹ and 'most stupid of men'¹⁰; while, in allusion to a passage in the *Confessions*,¹¹ he has the bad taste to charge him with admitting that his mother drank too much wine.¹² The truth seems to be that Julian was disappointed and mortified at being left in a minority; which he also regarded as a faithful remnant carrying on a righteous resistance against error supported by 'the powers

¹ *Contra Jul. Pel.* iv, § 44 (*Op.* x. 606 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 760).

² *Ibid.* v, § 14 (*Op.* x. 635 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 792); one of his most unqualified and yet typical statements of predestination and dereliction.

³ *Ibid.* vi, §§ 10, 11 (*Op.* x. 668 D, 669 A; *P. L.* xlv. 828 sq.)

⁴ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* ii. 127 (*Op.* x. 1003 F; *P. L.* xlv. 1195).

⁵ *Op.* x. 873–1386 (*P. L.* xlv. 1049–1608); Fleury, xxv. xxiv.

⁶ *Op. imp.* iii, § 20 (*Op.* x. 1059 F; *P. L.* xlv. 1255).

⁷ e. g. *ibid.* iii, § 35 (*Op.* x. 1065 G; *P. L.* xlv. 1262).

⁸ *Ibid.* i, § 7 (*Op.* x. 877 F; *P. L.* xlv. 1033).

⁹ *Ibid.* ii, § 28 (*Op.* x. 967 A; *P. L.* xlv. 1153).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* iii, § 145 (*Op.* x. 1106 B; *P. L.* xlv. 1306).

¹¹ *Conf.* ix, § 18 (*Op.* i. 164 A; *P. L.* xxxii. 772).

¹² *Op. imp.* i, § 68 (*Op.* x. 910 C; *P. L.* xlv. 1089).

that be'. From his exile in Cilicia he taunts his adversaries with appealing to the mob¹ and to the secular arm²; and he dubs the Roman clergy 'turncoats'.³ But, apart from the embitterment of exile, there is much excuse for Julian. Augustine had asserted the condemnation of the unbaptized, and the irresistibility of Grace. As to the former, Julian's moral sense recoiled from the terrible assertion.⁴ He looked upon it as a libel on God; and he took the line afterwards taken by John Stuart Mill against Calvinism, which he mistook for Christianity,⁵ holding that Augustinianism was immoral, inasmuch as it offended against our primary idea of justice.⁶ Then, in protest against the indefectibility of Grace,⁷ he repudiated determinism,⁸ and accused Augustine of quibbling about free-will.⁹ Had Augustine been more balanced, probably Julian would not have gone so far astray. We must therefore make allowances for Julian. But we must also make allowances for Augustine, in view of his own personal history and of his intensely logical mind. For these were the sources of two great defects in Augustinian theology. He had an imperfect conception of the equity of God; and reason may judge, as Butler argues, whether Scripture teaches what is plainly inconsistent with the teachings of nature and conscience.¹⁰ He had also an imperfect conception of the responsibility of man. Even with regard to the good he brought him to a sort of fixedness before his time.¹¹ But, if we have no power of resisting Grace, our adhesion to God is not free, and our responsibility is impaired. A Julian, therefore, had his place in saving the Church from the excesses of an Augustine.

§ 8. This aim—if we may now go back a few years—had inspired

¹ *Op. imp.* ii, §§ 1, 2 (*Op.* x. 957; *P. L.* xlv. 1142 sq.).

² *Ibid.* iii, § 35 (*Op.* x. 1066; *P. L.* xlv. 1262).

³ *Contra Iulianum*, i, § 13 (*Op.* x. 503 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 648).

⁴ *Op. imp.* i, § 48 (*Op.* x. 892; *P. L.* xlv. 1070); for Augustine's answer and its fallaciousness, see Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 78.

⁵ J. S. Mill, *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, 128 sq.

⁶ *Op. imp.* i, §§ 28, 37, 50 (*Op.* x. 884, 886, 894; *P. L.* xlv. 1061, 1063, 1072).

⁷ It appears as early as *De Sp. et litt.*, § 60 (*Op.* x. 120 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 240 sq.); on which see Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 159, 239–42.

⁸ *Contra duas epp. Pel.* ii, §§ 9, 10 (*Op.* x. 436 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 577), for the charge that Grace = Fate.

⁹ *Op. imp.* i, §§ 76 sqq. (*Op.* x. 919 sq.; *P. L.* xlv. 1101 sq.): see Mozley, *op. cit.* 245 sqq.

¹⁰ J. Butler, *Analogy*, II. iii, §§ 1, 13 (Works, II. 164, 174: ed. J. H. Bernard).

¹¹ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 247 sq.

some letters of his that reached Rome early in the pontificate of Pope Boniface I, 418–†22. The one was written by himself alone,¹ and charged the Catholics with being Manichaeans.² The other was addressed by Julian in company with his eighteen fellow-exiles to Rufus,³ bishop of Thessalonica 410–†31. By the vigilance of some Roman churchmen the two letters came into the hands of Boniface. The Pope gave them to Alypius,⁴ bishop of Tagaste 394–†430, who, about the end of 419, was returning from Italy to Africa with the extracts from Julian *Ad Turbantium* intended for Augustine. He desired him to show them to him; since his name was invidiously mentioned in both.⁵ In reply, Augustine dedicated to Pope Boniface his *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*,⁶ 420, in four books. Book I is an answer ‘to the letter which Julian is said to have sent to Rome’; and, in it, Augustine examines the charges levelled by Pelagians against Catholics; of, §§ 4, 5, destroying free-will; of saying, § 9, that marriage was not ‘instituted of God’, and, §§ 10, 11, that its use is of the devil; of holding, § 12, that the saints of the Old Testament were not freed from sin, and, §§ 13, 14, that St. Paul and the other Apostles were stained with impurity because they owned themselves subject to concupiscence. It is in dealing with this fifth objection that Augustine makes the interesting statement that, §§ 17–24, whereas he had once taken *Rom. vii. 7–25* as descriptive of the state of mind of one ‘under the law’,⁷ now he took it of the regenerate. Sixth, Catholics were alleged to say, § 25, that, in taking flesh, Christ Himself was made subject to sin; and, seventh, § 26, that Baptism did not thoroughly extirpate sin but left its roots in the evil flesh. This last was an ingenious attempt to dislodge Catholics from the vantage-ground of their argument from Baptism, by taking advantage of Augustine’s oft-repeated and self-evident assertion that, after Baptism, there remains concupiscence to be resisted. ‘This, however,’ replies Augustine, § 27, ‘is called sin because it is the result of sin.’ Then he discusses in seven ‘antitheses’, §§ 29–41, Julian’s

¹ *Contra duas epp. Pel. i, § 3* (*Op. x. 412 c*; *P. L. xliv. 551*).

² *Ibid.*, § 4 (*Op. x. 413 B*; *P. L. xliv. 552*).

³ *Ibid. i, § 3* (*ut sup.*).

⁴ *Ibid. i, § 3* (*Op. x. 413 A*; *P. L. xliv. 551*).

⁵ *Ibid. i, § 9* (*Op. x. 415*; *P. L. xliv.*).

⁶ *Op. x. 411–94* (*P. L. xliv. 549–638*); Tillemont, *Mém. xiii. 824 sqq.*; Fleury, *xxiv. xix.*

⁷ *Exp. qu. prop. ex Ep. ad Rom.*, §§ 44, 45 (*Op. iii. 910*; *P. L. xxxv. 2071*); *Exp. Ep. ad Gal.*, § 47 (*Op. iii. 971*; *P. L. xxxv. 2139*); *De div. qu. ad Simpl. i. i, §§ 7, 9* (*Op. vi. 83 sq.*; *P. L. xl. 105 sq.*).

exposition of the Pelagian point of view, and incidentally mentions, § 37, that, to his own knowledge, sudden conversions to Christianity were matters of daily occurrence. The book concludes, § 42, with a brief dismissal of Julian's plea for a rehearing of the whole case, i.e. for a General Council. The case was closed: all that was wanted was that he and his friends should 'do penance'; and it will be remembered that, in the hold of Count Valerius on the Emperor, Catholics had, and intended to use, the means of keeping the door shut. 'General Councils may not', i.e. cannot (*non possunt*), 'be called together without the commandment and will of Princes.'¹ In the remaining three books Augustine addresses himself to the letter of the Pelagianizing bishops to Rufus, the Papal Vicar for Eastern Illyricum. In it 'the writers . . . began by making free use of the nickname of Manichaeans. They then vilified the Roman clergy as a set of cowardly turncoats, and represented the anti-Pelagian doctrine as fatalistic and injurious to the divine impartiality.'² Book II deals with these charges. Thus, §§ 1-4, Catholics hold the middle doctrine between Manichaeans and Pelagians; and, §§ 5-8, the doctrine of the latter was never approved by the Roman clergy, though Zosimus for some time treated Caelestius with undue consideration. Under the name of Grace, §§ 9-12, they do not set up Fate; nor, §§ 13-16, attribute to God respect of persons, though it may be noted that at this point, § 15, there occurs a characteristically predestinarian statement of the Divine action. They maintain, § 17, that Grace is not given according to merit, and, §§ 18-23, that God inspires us with the first desire of goodness. Book III is devoted to an examination of further, § 1, charges made by Pelagians against Catholics; as if, §§ 2, 3, the teaching of the latter were disparaging to the Old Law, and, §§ 4, 5, incompatible with a full recognition of the efficacy of Baptism. 'They charged their opponents' next, §§ 6-13, 'with not admitting that the Holy Spirit had aided the good men of the Old Testament'; whereas, of course, like its moral teaching, 'they belong to us of the New'; and 'with insulting the sanctity', §§ 14, 15, of Prophets and Apostles, nay, § 16, of our Lord Himself; and they represent us, §§ 17-23, as content to look for the fulfilment of the commandments of God in the life to come. The argument, §§ 24-6, then anticipates the final topics of the whole treatise, as discussed in Book IV. Hitherto,

¹ *Art.* xxi.² W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* xlvi.

says Augustine, § 1, we have been repudiating misrepresentations of our teaching ; now let us examine the five points on which our adversaries are wont to dwell in support of theirs. They insidiously descant, §§ 2, 3, on the excellence of (1) God's creative works, §§ 4, 8, and of (2) marriage, § 9, with a view to excite prejudice against Original Sin ; of (3) the Law, §§ 10, 11, and (4) free-will, §§ 12-16, in order to render distasteful the notion of unmerited Grace ; and of, §§ 17-19, the lives of the Saints, by way of showing that men are not so frail after all, and that there have been persons exempt from sin even in this life. Of course, all these things are good, replies Augustine. Thus (1) our nature is good, § 4, being the work of the good God ; but, having fallen, § 6, it stands in need of a Saviour. (2) Marriage is good, and instituted of God ; but, § 9, the concupiscence that accompanies its use is due to sin. (3) The Law is good ; though, § 11, all it can do is to show us what sin is without removing it. (4) Free-will, again, is natural to man ; but, § 13, it is now so impaired that it must first be renewed by Grace. And so, too, (5) the righteousness of the Saints is real ; but, § 18, it is not perfect. Finally, there remains the standing grievance of Julian and his friends that, § 20, ' a dogma not less foolish than impious has been received throughout nearly the whole West ; and that unlearned bishops, sitting at home and not in synod, have been compelled to affirm it by their signatures.' Perhaps ; but the opposite teaching is a novelty, and the Fathers have condemned it by anticipation. Cyprian, §§ 21-8, and Ambrose, §§ 29-30, are quite explicit about the Fall, the need of Grace, and the imperfection of all earthly holiness ; and, §§ 32-4, it is by no means every heresy that requires—though, of course, it would like—an Universal Council to confute it.

§ 9. Taunts like these could never have been flung but at a hopelessly beaten foe. Boniface was neither disposed nor free to reopen the question ; and from his accession we may regard the overthrow of Pelagianism,¹ 420, as complete. All its leaders were now abandoned by the East. Atticus of Constantinople drove Julian and his friends from the Eastern Capital.² Theodotus of Antioch, 420-†8, at a Council there, 424, banished Pelagius from Jerusalem.³ Caelestine of Rome, 422-†32, ejected Caelestius

¹ Fleury, xxiv. xxv.

² Caelestine, *Ep.* xiii, § 1. (*P. L.* l. 469 B).

³ Marius Merc. *Comm.* iii, § 5 (*P. L.* xlvi. 100 sq.). This is the last mention of Pelagius.

from Italy,¹ and he was finally banished from Constantinople, 429.² After their condemnation at the third Oecumenical Council, in Ephesus,³ 431, Pelagius and Caelestius disappear. Julian, 'hunted by popular detestation from town to town', settled at last to teach in a school, and died, 454, in an obscure town of Sicily. His last act was to sell all he had for the relief of the poor in a grievous famine.⁴ Our compassion goes out to him; but we must not let it blind us to a sense of what we owe to his great opponent, Augustine. 'With a dulled sense of sin' and 'a depressed standard of virtue, Pelagianism . . . tended to the moral tone of . . . the religion which denies the Incarnation. The asceticism of its first promulgators and disciples could not neutralize the tendencies of a system opposed to mystery and to grace, and therefore hostile at once to the doctrinal and the moral standard of Christianity. The triumphant overthrow of such a school was the service which St. Augustine performed to the Church.' East and West had now declared themselves to be on his side; though the East had never sympathized with, and the West soon repudiated, 'the excess to which he pushed the truth which he defended'.⁵ In brief, the traditional theology was decisive, both in East and West, in favour of two points: (a) the need of Grace, in view of (b) the 'original' flaw in human nature.

¹ Prosper, *Contra Collat.* xxi, § 2 (*Op.* 363; *P. L.* li. 271 B).

² Marius Merc. *Comm.* Praef. (*P. L.* xlviii. 65 sqq.); presented to Theodosius II, 429.

³ Ibid. (*P. L.* xlviii. 66 sq.), and the *Relatio* (of the Council addressed to Pope Caelestine), § 6; Mansi, iv. 1337 B = Caelestine, *Ep.* xx, § 6 (*P. L.* l. 522 B).

⁴ H. H. Milman, *Latin Chr.*⁴ i. 164.

⁵ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 106: see a similar judgement in C. Merivale, *The Conversion of the Northern Nations*, 47 sq. (1866).

CHAPTER VIII

AUGUSTINIANISM, SEMI-PELAGIANISM, AND THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF GRACE, 429-529

WE have now to deal with the rivalry between Augustinianism, or 'the excess to which Augustine pushed the truth which he defended', and semi-Pelagianism; with the elimination of both; and with the final acceptance of a Catholic doctrine of Grace.

§ 1. In Africa,¹ 426, there was a monk of Adrumetum, now Susa in Tunis, by name Florus, a native of Uzalis. While on a visit to his home in company with Felix, one of the brethren, he came across the letter of Augustine to Sixtus, copied it, and sent it back to Adrumetum by Felix. Without the knowledge of the abbot, Valentine, Felix read it to the community. About half a dozen were perturbed, and thought that it annihilated free-will; and, when Florus returned, they fell upon him as the author of the dispute thus raised about the matter. Florus then showed the letter to the abbot; who, after some hesitation, at length allowed two of his monks—Cresconius and Felix²—afterwards joined by 'another' Felix—to go and obtain explanations from Augustine himself.³ On their arrival at Hippo, Augustine received them kindly, and wanted to supply them with all the literature relating to the Pelagians. But there was no time to get copies made: for they wished to get back, and to heal their dispute, by Easter,⁴ 3 April 427. The bishop therefore contented himself with giving them a letter to the abbot,⁵ to say that misunderstanding was at the bottom of the matter.⁶ But he kept them, after all, over Easter (because it was about then that 'the other Felix'⁷ arrived with further news of the disorders at Adrumetum): read and explained, beside his letter to Sixtus, several other documents of importance in the recent controversy; and, at last, sent them

¹ Aug. *Op.* x, Praef., §§ 25, 26 (*P. L.* xliv. 91-8); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 872-8; and Fleury, xxiv. xlv-xlvii from Aug. *Epp.* ccxiv-ccxvi (*Op.* ii. 791-9; *P. L.* xxxiii. 968-78).

² *Ep.* ccxiv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 791 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 968 sq.).

³ *Ep.* ccxvi, §§ 2, 3 (*Op.* ii. 796 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 975).

⁴ *Ep.* ccxiv, § 5 (*Op.* ii. 792 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 970).

⁵ *Ep.* ccxiv.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 6 (*Op.* ii. 792 E; *P. L.* xxxiii. 970).

⁷ *Ep.* ccxv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 793 D; *P. L.* xxxiii. 971).

back with these and with a new book dedicated to abbot Valentine and his monks.¹

(1) It was the *De gratia et libero arbitrio*,² 427. Referring, § 1, to the dissensions at Adrumetum, Augustine observes that we must equally avoid, §§ 2–5, denying free-will in order to establish grace and, §§ 6–9, denying grace in order to establish free-will. Grace, §§ 13–15, is not given according to merit, as the Pelagians say; nor does it consist simply, § 23, in the Law; § 25, in Nature; or, § 26, in the remission of past sins. We cannot merit it, §§ 27–30—I do not now say by good works (for that has been dealt with already), but—by good-will; for, §§ 31–2, it is God who endues us with a good-will, and, § 41, ‘has so great a power over men’s wills that He turns them whither He wills and when He wills’: ‘either, § 43, by inclining them to good of His free mercy, or to evil in accordance with their deserts—and this, by that judgment of His which is sometimes open and sometimes secret, but always just.’ The best instance, §§ 44–5, of grace is in infants: they have no merit to attract it, nor demerit, save original sin, to repel it; nor is there any reason why one should be preferred before another save in the secret judgements of God. ‘Read over, § 46, what I now write, dear brethren, continually; and God give you understanding.’ We need hardly be surprised that they failed to understand. Augustine, in this treatise, disclaims any denial of freedom³; but, in fact, ‘he teaches that the will is not only rendered helpless for good by the Fall but is absolutely determined for good by the coming of Grace; and he compares our condition to that of the angels.’⁴ We are ‘free from evil’⁵ instead of ‘free for evil or good’; while others, as ‘determined for evil’ are ‘free from good’. This was simply to use the word ‘free’ in an esoteric sense: ‘free for good,’ in the sense of being turned by a dominant Grace toward

¹ *Ep.* ccxv., §§ 2, 3 (*Op.* ii. 794; *P. L.* xxxiii. 972 sq.).

² *Op.* x. 717–44 (*P. L.* xlv. 881–912).

³ *Ibid.*, § 31 (*Op.* x. 734 A; *P. L.* xlv. 899).

⁴ ‘Certum est nos facere, cum facimus; sed Ille facit ut faciamus, praebendo vires efficacissimas voluntati,’ *ibid.*, § 32 (*Op.* x. 735 A; *P. L.* xlv. 900 sq.). Free-will is thus ‘a state of bondage to righteousness’ (Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 236), and ‘a combination of free-will with necessity’, like that of God, the Angels, and the Saints; for we attribute to them ‘a necessity on the side of goodness’, and yet the operation of a genuine will. The peculiarity, therefore, of Augustine’s theory does not consist in the combination, but in the introduction of necessity before its time (*ibid.* 247).

⁵ ‘In tantum libera est [sc. voluntas] in quantum liberata est [sc. a dominante cupidino],’ *Retract.* i. xv, § 4 (*Op.* i. 25 B; *P. L.* xxxii 609).

good, and secured against a lapse into evil. The abbot, indeed, acknowledged the treatise in a letter of thanks¹; but some of the brethren not unnaturally observed, when they read it: 'On this showing, we ought not to be censured when we do wrong: our superiors should be content with instructing us and praying for us²; for it is not my fault if, according to Augustine, I have no freedom.'

(2) The objection was brought to his notice; and he dealt with it in a second treatise addressed to Valentine and his monks, under the title of *De correptione et gratia*,³ 427. Recalling, § 2, the doctrine of Law, Grace, and Free-will, he shows, § 3, that only by Grace are we free to do well. 'Why then', it is objected, § 4, 'are we bidden to do well, when it is not we who do it, but "God who worketh in us both to will and to do"?' 'Better', is the reply, 'if we do well to give God thanks; and, if not, to pray for the grace we have not yet received.' 'Meanwhile then', the monks are represented as pleading, § 5, 'let not our superiors rest satisfied with teaching us what we ought to do and praying for us: but let them not correct or reprove us for, § 6, what is not our fault, so long as we have not received it.' 'It is, however, your own fault, §§ 7-8, that you are wicked; and, still more, that you refuse to be corrected for it.' 'But', they persist, § 9, 'we have not received obedience; why, then, are we corrected as if it were in our power to bestow it on ourselves?' The answer strikes deeper down when it says: 'There is a depravity in you: and, § 12, whether you belong to the class of those who have not heard the Gospel; or of those, who, after having heard it and being converted, have not persevered; or of those who refused it out of hand; or to the class of infants unbaptized, you have not been separated from the mass of perdition, and so deserve not correction but eternal condemnation.' Those, on the other hand, § 13, who have been so separated, hear and obey and have bestowed upon them the gift of perseverance to the end because, §§ 14-16, they are predestinate. Why God, § 17, has given this gift of final perseverance to one and not to another, it is impossible to say⁴: 'O, the depths,' &c., is the only solution. His ways, § 19, are inscrutable. We must therefore,

¹ *Ep. cxxvi* (*Op. ii.* 796-9; *P. L.* xxxiii. 974 sq.).

² *Retract. ii.* § 67 (*Op. i.* 64 B; *P. L.* xxxii. 656).

³ *Op. x.* 749-78 (*P. L.* xlv. 915-46); Tillemont, xiii. 878; Fleury, xxiv. xlvii.

⁴ For a summary account of the doctrine of Final Perseverance, see Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 208.

§ 25, correct the sinner, though we do not know whether the discipline will be of any advantage to him, nor whether he be predestinate or no. There is, however, a further difficulty here, § 26: 'Adam was not separated from the mass of perdition; it did not exist in his day; why then was not the gift of perseverance bestowed on him? and, if he did not have it, how is he guilty for not persevering?' 'Adam', is the reply, §§ 27–34, 'in his state of innocence before the Fall, did not need more than such assistance as makes perseverance possible—*adiutorium sine quo non fit*¹—for he had the capacity of choice. He was given therefore all that he needed. We, his offspring, owing to the state of corrupted nature consequent on the Fall, are weaker and need more; our power of choice, i.e. our free-will, is gone; we therefore have a controlling grace—*adiutorium quo fit*²—such as makes perseverance certain.' Ours, therefore, is, §§ 35–8, the 'greater freedom'³ of 'irresistible'⁴ grace. It belongs, § 39, to those who are predestinate; their number is fixed⁵; but, § 43, as none of us knows whether he be included in it or not, he must let himself be corrected, even though the correction may turn out in his case to have been only inflictive.⁶ And, §§ 44–9, we must endeavour the salvation of all men, just because we cannot tell whom God intends actually to save.

Augustinianism was becoming more and more an 'offence'. God, it would seem from the treatises sent to Adrumetum, had given numbers of men no opportunity: and yet He would punish them. Voices were certain to be raised in protest by other Christian teachers.

§ 2. Meanwhile, a recrudescence took place, in Gaul and Britain, 427–30, of the older Pelagianism.

(1) In Gaul it was connected with Leporius,⁷ a native of Trèves, and a monk of blameless life. He ascribed his blamelessness to his

¹ *De corrept. et gratia*, § 32.

² *Ibid.*, § 34, and Document No. 187. The semi-Pelagians took exception to this passage.

³ 'Maior libertas', *ibid.*, § 35 (*Op.* x. 769 E; *P. L.* xliv. 937).

⁴ 'Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanæ ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur', *ibid.*, § 38, and Document No. 187; and see Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 163–8.

⁵ 'Certus numerus', § 39; 'Certissimum et felicissimum numerum', § 42 (*Op.* x. 772 A, 773 F; *P. L.* xliv. 940, 942).

⁶ Not a 'salubre medicamentum', but a 'poenale tormentum', § 43 (*Op.* x. 774 B; *P. L.* xliv. 942).

⁷ Cassian, *De Inc. Chr.* i, §§ 4, 5 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 23 sq.); Gennadius [c. 450–500], *De script. eccl.*, § 59 (*P. L.* lviii. 1092 sq.); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 878–85; Fleury, xxiv. xlix.

own free-will ; for he was a disciple of Pelagius. The interest of his case, however, is that it illustrates the connexion between Pelagianism and Nestorianism. For Leporius went on to conceive the spiritual experience of our Lord in terms of his own. The Saviour also, he held, was an ordinary man. He had used His free-will so well as to have lived without sin. His is the great Example. We can profit from it if we choose.¹ The letter² in which he published these opinions gave no little scandal ; and Cassian, 360–†435, now settled in Provence since c. 415, urged him to withdraw.³ But to no purpose. The bishops intervened : in particular, Proculus of Marseilles ; and Leporius, driven from Gaul, took refuge in Africa. Here he came under the influence of Augustine⁴ ; and it may have been he who took part, as one of the seven priests in company with two bishops, in the nomination of Heraclius to be Augustine's successor in the see of Hippo.⁵ At any rate, he came to acknowledge his error, and made public confession of it at Carthage. Then, in a recantation⁶ addressed to Proculus and others, he confesses that ' God was born of Mary ',⁷ and that ' Jesus is the only, not the adopted, Son of God '⁸ ; thus repudiating his anticipation of Nestorianism. There follows a similar repudiation of Pelagianism. ' We likewise execrate what we said in ascribing to Christ labour, merit and faith ; making Him almost like one of the Saints, though this was far from our intention.'⁹ Aurelius and Augustine subscribed the recantation¹⁰ ; and wrote to commend him once more to Proculus and the bishops of Gaul.¹¹ It is possible that Augustine himself was the author of the document put into the mouth of Leporius ; in any case, he must have the credit of making a genuine convert from Pelagianism.

(2) In Britain, shortly afterwards, the same credit fell, but on a larger scale, to Germanus,¹² bishop of Auxerre 418–†448, and Lupus,¹³ bishop of Troyes 433–†479. Pelagius himself had left Britain in early life ; but Severian, a bishop there who had adopted

¹ Cassian, *De Inc. Chr.* i, § 3 (*Op.* ii ; *P. L.* l. 21 sq.).

² *Leporii Libellus*, § 8 (*P. L.* xxxi. 1227 B).

³ Cassian, *De Inc. Chr.* i, § 4 (*Op.* ii ; *P. L.* l. 24 B).

⁴ *Aug. Ep.* cccix, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 811 A ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 991).

⁵ *Ep.* ccxiii (*Op.* ii. 788–90 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 966–8).

⁶ *Leporii Libellus* (*P. L.* xxxi. 1221–30).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 10.

¹¹ *Aug. Ep.* cccix [A. D. 426] (*Op.* ii. 810 sq. ; *P. L.* xxxii. 991 sq.).

¹² Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 1–30 ; Fleury, xxiii. xlvi.

¹³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 126–41.

his opinions, had a son named Agricola devoted to their propagation.¹ The clergy, as a rule, were firm in their loyalty to the traditional faith; though a British bishop, Fastidius² by name, may have been influenced by Pelagian ideas. The laity found them more attractive. At length, as Britain had no divines of learning sufficient to deal with the new propaganda, it was resolved to appeal to the mother-church of Gaul. 'At a numerous synod,'³ Germanus, according to his biographer, Constantius of Lyons, c. 490, and Lupus were sent 'to uphold in Britain the belief in divine grace.'⁴ But according to Prosper, who has the advantage over Constantius of writing as a contemporary, it was Pope Caelestinus who sent Germanus 'as his representative'; while, shortly afterwards, he sent Palladius, 431, as bishop to Ireland.⁵ He thus 'took pains', says Prosper, not only 'to keep the Roman island Catholic, but to make the barbarian island Christian'.⁶ The two statements as to the source of the mission of Germanus are not necessarily inconsistent: Pope and Council may alike have had their share in it. Germanus had been 'Duke'⁷ of a wide district, before he was unwillingly taken and consecrated⁸ to be his successor by Amator, bishop of Autissiodorum (Auxerre), besides being a man of birth and wealth. Lupus was a few years his junior, the brother of Vincent of Lerins, and one of the correspondents⁹ of that *grand seigneur*, the poet and letter-writer, Sidonius Apollinaris,¹⁰ bishop of Urbs Arverna (now Clermont-Ferrand) 469-†79. Both envoys, therefore, were men of distinction, apart from their episcopal rank. They crossed to Britain; and, 'after preaching in churches, and even in streets and fields and in the open country',¹¹ they at last succeeded in bringing the Pelagians to confront them, apparently at Verulam: for it is in reference to this event that there occurs the first known allusion to the story of St. Alban, Germanus being said to have visited his tomb after the overthrow of the Pelagians.¹² Germanus and Lupus then lent their aid to the Britons; both of

¹ Bede, *H. E.* i, § 17.

² Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, § 56 (*P. L.* lviii. 1091 A); Bardenhewer, 505; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 268, n. 3.

³ Constantius, *Vita*, xix, § 41 (*Acta SS. Iul.* vii. 211).

⁴ Bede, *H. E.* i, § 17.

⁵ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 429, 431 (*Op.* 744; *P. L.* lviii. 594 sq.).

⁶ Prosper, *Contra Collat.* xxi, § 2 (*Op.* 363; *P. L.* lviii. 271).

⁷ *Vita*, § 1 (*Acta SS. Iul.* vii. 202).

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 5 (202 sq.).

⁹ *P. L.* lviii. 63-5, 551 sq., 554 sq.

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 195-284; Bardenhewer, 606 sq.

¹¹ *Vita*, § 47 (*Acta SS. Iul.* vii. 213).

¹² *Ibid.*, § 49 (213).

them by their prayers and Germanus by his generalship, to win the Alleluia victory over Picts and Scots,¹ at Easter, 430, the site of it being traditionally associated with 'Maes-Garmon', or 'German's Field', near Mold in Flintshire.² With that they departed, having freed the land from 'foes spiritual and corporeal'.³ But Germanus came again to finish the destruction of Pelagianism in 447, accompanied this time by Severus, bishop of Trèves 446-†55, the disciple of Lupus. Interesting as it is to us, the revival and overthrow of Pelagianism proper in Britain was not so serious a matter as the semi-Pelagian movement.⁴ To this we must revert, as it developed on either coast of the Western Mediterranean; in Africa, and in the South of Gaul.

§ 3. In Africa, about 427, a Carthaginian monk named Vitalis maintained the purely natural origin of the first movements of faith or good desire; and that God only inclines the will to good by setting before it His law, which we may accept or refuse.⁵ But subsequent to the initial act of faith which he thus referred to the unassisted will, Vitalis acknowledged the need for Grace. This was to affirm what, from the seventeenth century onwards, has been called semi-Pelagianism⁶; and 'the whole question', as Hooker puts it, was 'now grown unto this issue, whether man may [i.e. can] without God, seek God'.⁷ 'If he may,' replies Augustine in a letter to Vitalis,⁸ appealing once more to the settled institutions of the Church, 'then, § 2, we must revise our habits of public worship. Thus we shall not pray for those to whom we preach the Gospel, but only preach to them. So raise your voice, Vitalis, against the prayers of the Church; and when—as at the intercessions on Good Friday⁹—you hear the priest at the altar exhorting the people to pray for unbelievers that God would convert them, for catechumens that He would inspire them with a desire

¹ *Vita*, §§ 51-2 (213 sq.); Bede, *H. E.* i, § 20.

² W. Bright, *Chapters* ³, &c., 22. ³ *Vita*, § 52 (*Acta SS. Iul.* vii, 214).

⁴ On semi-Pelagianism, see J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 264-301, and W. Bright, *Lessons*, app. xx.

⁵ Aug. *Ep.* ccxvii, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 799; *P. L.* xxxiii. 978); Fleury, xxiv. 1; W. Bright, *Lessons*, 292 sq.

⁶ For this date, see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 274, n. 1, and J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, iii. 265, n. 4. Prosper's phrase is simply 'Pelagianae pravitatis reliquiae', Aug. *Ep.* ccxxv, § 7 (*Op.* ii. 824 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1006).

⁷ R. Hooker, *E. P.* v. app. i (ed. J. Keble, ii. 547).

⁸ *Ep.* ccxvii (*Op.* ii. 799-809; *P. L.* xxxiii. 978-86), and Document No. 186.

⁹ L. Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 172 sq.; and, for a relic of them, our three Good Friday collects.

for baptism, and for the faithful that they may persevere through His grace, greet these pious exhortations with a laugh, and say that you will not pray God for unbelievers that He may make them believers ; for this is not a gift of His mercy, but the function of their will. But,' he concludes, § 30, 'I am disposed to believe that you agree with us that we ought, as is our wont, to pray to God for those who are not willing to believe that they may be willing to believe, and so forth . . . You ought then undoubtedly to acknowledge that the wills of men are anticipated (*praeveniri*) by God's grace, and that God makes them will the good as to which they were unwilling.' Unfortunately, however, in reaching this conclusion as to the need of prevenient, as well as of co-operating, grace, Augustine had let it be seen only too clearly what he meant by it. Apart from the unnatural interpretation of 1 *Tim.* ii. 4, now customary with him, to mean, e.g. § 19, that none are saved except by the action of God's own will, he speaks of, § 23, the divine preparation of the will as a process in which the will is purely passive ; of, § 24, the conversion of the unbeliever as effected 'with the ease of omnipotence' and, § 26, of the priest at the altar as praying God that He would compel the nations to come in. Thus he evidently conceived of the 'prevenient' action of grace as dominant and determinative. We do not know how Vitalis took it ; but the effect of such exaggeration was to rouse prolonged opposition in the South of Gaul.

§ 4. Early in the fifth century, the Riviera, as we call it, was the centre, for Gaul, of the religious life of the time. There were two hearths from which it radiated : the isles of the Lerins, and Marseilles.

The isles of the Lerins¹ lie off Cannes. The larger and nearer the coast is St. Marguerite, formerly Lerona, famed for its citadel in which 'the man with the iron mask' at the end of the seventeenth century, and whence Marshal Bazaine escaped in 1874. Half a mile out to sea lies the smaller and more famous island, once called Lerinum, but now St. Honorat, after the founder of the monastic community there. Honoratus² was a saint of the type of Sulpicius Severus³ and Paulinus of Nola⁴ : by birth a man of

¹ A. C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The School of Lerins*, c. ii (1905), and *The isles of the Lerins* (1913).

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 464-86 ; Fleury, xxiv. lvii ; T. S. Holmes, *The Christian Church in Gaul*, 281 sqq.

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 586-611.

⁴ *Ibid.* xiv. 1-146.

rank and prospects, by vocation a Religious. Accompanied by his brother Venantius, and under the guidance of Caprasius, a friend of maturer years, he sought solitude in Greece. But Venantius died there, at Methone (Modon, in the South-west of the Peloponnese); and the company returned to find, if they could, a wilderness in the West. They found it, at last, off their own shores at Lerins: which, for this reason, was the more attractive to Honoratus as well as because it formed part of the diocese of the venerated Leontius, bishop of Forum Iulii (Fréjus) 419–†32. Such was the origin of the abbey of Lerins, 408–1788. In its early days it stood to France as did Whitby¹ to England. For it became a nursery of scholars and bishops—Honoratus, himself bishop of Arles 426–†9; his pupil and successor, Hilary,² bishop of Arles 429–†49; Vincent,³ the author of the *Commonitorium*, 434, and Salvian⁴ of the *De gubernatione Dei*, 439–51; Lupus, bishop of Troyes 429–†79; Eucherius,⁵ bishop of Lyons 435–†50; Faustus,⁶ abbot of Lerins 433, and bishop of Riez 462–†85; and Caesarius, bishop of Arles 502–†42, to whom by some,⁷ as by others to other members of the school of Lerins,⁸ has been ascribed the *Quicunque vult*.

Some distance along the coast to the west of Lerins shone a second beacon of Christian piety, at the ancient Phocæan colony of Marseilles. It was kindled about five years after the founding of Lerins, when, in 415, John Cassian⁹ opened two monasteries, one for men and the other for women, near Marseilles. Cassian himself was born in Scythia,¹⁰ i.e. in the Roman province of that name near the delta of the Danube, now the Dobrudja, of educated and wealthy parents. Trained, with a friend named Germanus, at one of the monasteries of Bethlehem, he visited the cells of Egypt; and, with Germanus, stayed there for ten years, 385–95. Thence they passed to Constantinople, possibly driven out by Theophilus; for at the Eastern Capital Cassian was associated with Chrysostom, who ordained him deacon. After Chrysostom's final exile in 404, Cassian and Germanus were sent on a mission, 405,

¹ W. Bright, *Chapters* 3, &c., 310 sq.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 36–97; Holmes, 452 sqq.

³ Ibid. xv. 143–6.

⁴ Ibid. xvi. 181–94.

⁵ Ibid. xv. 110–36.

⁶ Ibid. xvi. 408–36.

⁷ As once [1901] by Dom Morin, though he now assigns it to Martin, bishop of Braga 572–†80 (*J. T. S.* xii. 161–90, 337–59—Jan. and Apr. 1911).

⁸ As by A. E. Burn [1896] to Honoratus; by Burn and C. H. Turner [1900] to Eusebius of Vercellæ; by G. D. W. Ommanney [1897] to Vincent.

⁹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 157–89; Fleury, xxiv. lvii; and, for his writings, *P. L.* xlix, 1, and tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* xi. 184 sqq.

¹⁰ Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, § 61 (*P. L.* lviii. 1094 sq.).

to Rome by the clergy of Constantinople, to obtain the protection of Innocent I for their persecuted archbishop.¹ There Cassian was ordained priest ; and, finding it safer, perhaps, to remain in the West, he at length settled near Marseilles. As one who had lived with the solitaries of Egypt and was now abbot of two important foundations, Cassian came to occupy a position of commanding influence. He was the link between the monasticism of the East and the West ; and, at the instance of Castor,² bishop of Apt Julia 419-†28, now Apt, on a tributary of the Durance, some thirty-three miles east-south-east of Avignon, composed two treatises—the *Instituta*,³ 426, and the *Collationes*,⁴ 429—for the instruction and edification of the monks. The *Institutes* deal with the external life of the monk⁵ ; and, after describing in Books I-IV, the life and rule of the ascetic communities in Palestine and Egypt, the author proceeds to delineate and denounce, in Books V-XII, the eight ‘capital sins’⁶ of monastic life. In the *Collations*, he aims at the internal or spiritual perfection of the monk⁷ : and the book is so called, as recording, in twenty-four conversations, the reminiscences of Cassian and his friend Germanus in their intercourse with the wit and wisdom of the desert.⁸ Both works were written in a lively style, and quickly won wide acceptance as manuals of monasticism. It was therefore the more alarming, to the friends of Augustine, that in both there were traces of semi-Pelagianism. And this is particularly the case with the thirteenth *Collation*, ‘On the protection of God’. ‘God’, says the abbot Chaeremon there, ‘no sooner sees in us the beginnings of a good will than He forthwith enlightens, strengthens and excites it to salvation : and so causes that to grow which either He himself has planted or which He sees to have sprung up by efforts of our own.’⁹ And there are other examples¹⁰ of similar language, in which the initiative in good is ascribed to us and to God its consummation only.

¹ Palladius, *Vita*, c. iii (*Op.* xiii. 11 D ; *P. G.* xlvii. 13 sq.).

² Cassian, *Op.* i (*P. L.* xlix. 53 sq.).

³ *Ibid.* (*P. L.* xlix. 53-476) ; tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* xi. 201 sqq.

⁴ *Ibid.* (*P. L.* xlix. 477-1328) ; tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* xi. 295 sqq.

⁵ *Inst.* ii, § 9 (*P. L.* xlix. 97 A, B).

⁶ *Inst.* v, § 2 (*P. L.* xlix. 203). On these ‘Octo principalia vitia’, see note in F. E. Brightman, *The Preces Privatae of L. Andrewes*, 319 sq.

⁷ *Inst.* ii, § 9 (*ut sup.*).

⁸ On which see J. O. Hannay, *The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism and The Wisdom of the Desert*.

⁹ *Coll.* xiii, § 8 (*P. L.* xlix. 912 sq.).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, §§ 9, 11 (*P. L.* xlix. 919 sq., 923 A).

Cassian, therefore, and with him Hilary, now bishop of Arles, 429–†49, would, of course, disclaim all sympathy with Pelagianism; but they thought that Augustine had gone too far. They held, with Vitalis, that we must, in the interests of human responsibility, affirm, at all costs, that nature unaided can take the first step towards its own recovery. Semi-Pelagianism was like Pelagianism in saying that there was a time when grace was not needed; unlike it, in attaching a real sense to grace. On the other hand, semi-Pelagians, though they might better be called semi-Augustinians, as attaching a real sense to grace, differed from Augustine in two points.¹ They denied the need for prevenient grace, and they held that grace was not irresistible.

§ 5. It was this state of Gallic opinion that led, in 428–9, to Augustine's *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*—the second and last pair of his extreme books. He was made aware of it by two zealous laymen, Prosper and Hilary, both monks of Marseilles. This Hilary is to be distinguished from the archbishop of Arles; but is apparently the same as he who, fifteen years earlier, had informed Augustine of the growth of Pelagianism in Sicily. He is otherwise unknown to us. But Prosper² of Aquitaine, till his death in 463, gained increasing reputation as the champion of Augustinianism: in poems, such as the *De ingratis*³ [before 430] directed against the 'graceless' semi-Pelagians, or the ironical *Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseos*,⁴ 431–2; in a series of *Pro Augustino responsiones*,⁵ one of them being against the objections to the Augustinian doctrine of predestination entertained by Vincent of Lerins⁶; and in a formal treatise *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio liber contra Collatorem*.⁷ This last is directed against Cassian the author of the *Collationes*, and takes up his assertions, one specimen of which has been quoted above, to the effect that sometimes grace 'prevents' the will, but, as often as not, the will forestalls the action of grace. Prosper also

¹ The two points were determined by reaction from Augustine's overstatements, and 'the Semi-Pelagians would have admitted grace to be necessary at the outset as well as throughout the process, if Augustine had not connected it with the ideas of irresistibility in its working and of unconditional predestination as its source', W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* lv.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 1–31; Fleury, xxiv. lx, xxvi. xxiv; Bardenhewer, 511 sqq.; J. Tixeront, *Hist. dogm.* iii, 269 sqq.

³ *Op.* 105–89 (*P. L.* li. 91–148).

⁴ *Op.* 197–9 (*P. L.* li. 153 sq.).

⁵ *Op.* 203–56 (*P. L.* li. 155–202).

⁶ *Op.* 227–40 (*P. L.* li. 177–86).

⁷ *Op.* 307–66 (*P. L.* li. 215–76).

has left us his *Chronicon*¹ which continues that of Jerome ; and—in the last of its three editions—carries events down to the sack of Rome by Gaiseric,² King of the Vandals, 455 ; and differs from its predecessors in the prominence that it gives to the history of Christian thought.

It was this Prosper—destined afterwards to take rank as the loyal and lucid exponent of his master's theology—who, with Hilary, now wrote to inform him of the opposition it was arousing in the South of Gaul.³ 'I am unknown to you by face,' begins Prosper, § 1, but, § 2, I must let you know that many of the servants of Christ who live at Marseilles and were already inclined to disagree with certain points in your anti-Pelagian writings, have been seriously put off by your book *De correptione et gratia*. They are men of high character and great influence ; and, § 3, their position is much as follows :—Certainly all men sinned in Adam, and no man can be restored except through grace : but predestination leads, in the case of the fallen, to recklessness and, with the good, to lukewarmness ; since neither diligence in the reprobate, nor negligence in the elect, can make any difference. Virtue is destroyed if the Divine Decree prevent the human will ; and predestination simply introduces a fatal necessity. Our belief, in short, is contrary to edification ; and, were it true, it ought not to be preached. Others, § 4, more frankly Pelagian, hold that grace consists in the gifts of nature : make good use of them, and you merit the attainment of saving grace. As for infants and heathen, § 5, some of whom die before they come to years of discretion or otherwise have the chance of attaining to saving grace, they are saved or lost according as God foresees that they would have responded or not, had they had the chance. But, in any case, God willeth all men to be saved and, § 6, our Lord died for all. So far as God is concerned, therefore, eternal life is prepared for all ; if, on the other hand, you look to man's free-will, eternal life is for those only who believe of their own accord and so merit the assistance of grace. Thus, to say, as they do, that the initial step in a man's salvation rests with himself is a serious thing : the more so, § 7, as it is said by men of high character, recently promoted to the episcopate. Show them, § 8, that the Christian Faith is attacked

¹ *Op.* 685–754 (*P. L.* li. 535–606). 'In lack of other sources, very important for the first half of the fifth century,' Bury's *Gibbon*, iii, app. i, p. 488.

² *Gibbon*, c. xxxvi (iv. 5) ; *Hodgkin*, ii. 284.

³ *Aug. Ep.* ccxxv (*Op.* ii 820–5 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1002–7).

by what they say ; that prevenient and co-operating grace are compatible with the freedom of the will ; what is the relation between predestination and foreknowledge ; and so, I pray you, enlighten their understanding. It is well worth while, § 9, for their leader is the distinguished Hilary, bishop of Arles ; and, in all respects but this, he is an ardent admirer of your doctrine.

The other Hilary seconded the appeal of Prosper in much the same terms¹ ; but he adds, § 6 (with special reference to the exceptions of the Massilians to certain positions adopted by Augustine in the *De correptione et gratia* ²), that, according to them, to say the gift of perseverance was not given to Adam while it is given to some of his descendants is to drive the rest to despair ; and again, § 7, that the number of the elect and of the reprobate is not fixed. The Massilians, however, § 9, profess the warmest admiration for Augustine on all other points than the one now in dispute. My letter, § 10, is simply an appendix to that of my friend Prosper.

§ 6. Old as he was, and much preoccupied, Augustine could not bring himself to refuse the request of Prosper and Hilary. He sent them a reply in two books.

(1) The first of these is known as his *De praedestinatione sanctorum*.³ 'I fully acknowledge', he writes, § 2, 'the difference between those good men for whom you are anxious and their predecessors.' They are semi-Pelagians, not Pelagians : 'they only assert that the *initial* step to faith and salvation proceeds from unaided free-will : this first step taken, all else, according to them, is the gift of God. But, § 3, this will not stand. Not the increase of faith only, but its first beginnings also are the gift of God, if we are, § 4, to take St. Paul for our guide when he writes : "To you it hath been granted, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf" [*Phil.* i. 29] ; or again, § 5, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to account anything as from ourselves" [*2 Cor.* iii. 5]. I am aware, § 7, that I once took their view and held that the faith by which we first come to believe in God is no gift of His but a thing of our own ; so that, on this showing, grace would come after faith. But this was before I became a bishop. It was, § 8, a mistake ; and I was led to abandon the error, which your neighbours still maintain, chiefly by the text :

¹ Aug. *Ep.* ccxxvi (*Op.* ii. 825-9 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1007-12) ; Fleury, xxiv. lix.

² esp. § 34.

³ *Op.* x. 789-820 (*P. L.* xlv. 959-92) ; Fleury, xxiv. lxi ; W. Bright, *Anti-P. T.* lvi.

“What hast thou that thou didst not receive?” [1 *Cor.* iv. 7]. Thus, §§ 9–10 faith itself is to be included in what we have received ; and so, § 12, it is to be reckoned among the works which do not precede but follow the grace of God. Faith then, § 16, in its commencement as well as in its perfection is a gift of God, and, like His other gifts, is not bestowed upon all ; if some are left out, it simply remains that God did not choose to give it them. And this brings me, § 19, to the question of predestination. It is the preparation for grace, and differs from it as the preparation from the gift prepared for. Predestination differs also from foreknowledge. By foreknowledge God knows even those things which He will not Himself do ; sins, for instance ; by predestination He foresees those things which He means to do. Grace, then, is predestination taking effect ; as when He himself makes us do what He commands. We act, § 22, and He causes us to act. Its highest examples, § 23, are to be seen in infants, and in the Saviour ; for, § 24, by no antecedent merits are infants that are saved to be distinguished from the rest ; nor, § 30, had the Human Nature of our Lord done anything that it alone should be united to His Divine Person.’ Augustine’s argument here is at fault, because he overlooks the impersonality of our Lord’s Human Nature.¹ But, he goes on, § 32, it was simply predestinated, or ‘determined’ [*Rom.* i. 4 ; R. V. marg.], to this privilege, as St. Paul expressly says. So with us. There are two sorts of calling ; one, common to those who refuse to come to the wedding ; the other, peculiar to the predestinate, i.e. ‘to them that are called according to His purpose’ [*Rom.* viii. 28]—a calling effectual and, § 33, ‘without repentance’ [*Rom.* xi. 29]. These are called, § 34, not because they believe, but in order that they may believe.² Theirs, § 38, is an absolute predestination, irrespective of foreseen piety ; and, §§ 39–41, the calling includes everything, not excepting the faith which God gives to those whom He calls. So, § 43, the first steps toward faith are not of ourselves but are the gift of God.

(2) But what of its end ? The answer to this further question is given in the *De dono perseverantiae*³ : really a sequel to the previous book, but called by this new title because, § 1, ‘we affirm’,

¹ Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* 152 sqq. ; W. Bright, *Anti-P. T.* lvii ; and *St. Leo* ², 137, 143, 150.

² On this point, see Mozley, 146.

³ *Op.* x. 821–58 (*P. L.* xlv. 993–1034) ; Fleury, xxiv. lxii.

says Augustine, ' that final perseverance is a gift of God also. The perseverance, § 2, of which it is said, " He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved," is a gift of God ; as, § 3, is implied by our praying for it. The Lord's Prayer, §§ 4–14, at least as expounded in St. Cyprian, *De dominica oratione*, is little else than a prayer for perseverance. No less is implied, § 15, by the other prayers of the Church. She prays that unbelievers may come to believe ; therefore it is God who converts them to faith. She prays that the faithful may persevere : God therefore it is who gives them the gift of perseverance. He has foreseen that He will do so, and this is predestination. But, § 16, it may be asked : " Why is not grace bestowed according to men's merits ? " " Because God is merciful." " Why not upon all ? " " Because He is just." Of two children, § 21, equally affected by original sin, He takes the one and leaves the other. Of two adult unbelievers, He effectually calls the one and not the other. His judgements are unsearchable. Still more inscrutable why, of two pious Christians, perseverance is given to the one and denied to the other. All we can say is that the former is of the number of the predestinate, while the latter is not. The mystery, § 22, is impenetrable ; and its impenetrability we may learn from our Lord Himself, when He said, § 23, " Woe unto thee, Chorazin ! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida ! for, if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes " [*Matt.* xi. 21 sq.]. For it cannot be said, after this, that God refuses the preaching of the Gospel to those only whom He foresees would not profit by it. He refused it to Tyre and Sidon, who would have profited by it. Why ? Simply because they were not predestinate. But the Massilians, as Prosper has informed me, § 34, object that this doctrine of predestination is a dangerous one to preach ; it is incompatible, they say, with preaching, teaching and correction. Yet St. Paul [*Phil.* ii. 13] and our Lord [*John* vi. 65] both taught it ; and, § 35, will any one say that God has not foreseen to whom He will give faith or final perseverance ? Now predestination is nothing more than this foreknowledge and preparation of the benefits of God by which those are most surely delivered who are delivered. The rest of mankind, by the just judgement of God, are left where they were, in the mass of perdition ; precisely where the Tyrians and Sidonians were left who could and would have believed, if only they had been allowed to see these miracles of the

Lord.’¹ Augustine thus asserts, with the most unqualified emphasis, that perseverance is a pure gift, bestowed and withheld for reasons to us inscrutable ; and that predestination and dereliction are alike absolute. We can hardly be surprised, therefore, to find him admitting that discretion must, of course, be used, §§ 58–60, in preaching a doctrine like this to a general congregation ; they must always be assumed “to be among the predestinate. As for the reprobate, § 61, they should be alluded to in the third person only. Above all, §§ 63–5, we must urge the ordinary man to leave these disputes to the learned ; and bid him remember that the *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*, i.e. that the language of the official prayers of the Church is the layman’s guide to right belief. As for myself, §§ 66–8, I write under correction ; and look for it from the doctors of the Church.

§ 7. So ended Augustine’s part in the Pelagian controversy, save for the brief and clear summary of its issues in the last chapter of his *De haeresibus*,² c. 428. This was a compendium of the history of heresies, written toward the close of his life, in answer to the entreaties of Quodvultdeus,³ deacon and afterwards archbishop of Carthage 437–†54. In it Augustine makes use of the similar compilations of Epiphanius⁴ and Philaster,⁵ bishop of Brescia 379–†87. But he did not live to finish either this or the larger *Opus imperfectum*.⁶ For, in the year when he began it, a great disaster⁷ happened to the Empire in Africa. Honorius died 27 August 423. His ‘poultry and his people’⁸ passed under the charge of John, a clerk in a Government Office, who declared himself Emperor and ruled at Ravenna for eighteen months. But the House of Theodosius were still masters of the resources of the Empire ; and, with the aid of the Eastern Court, Valentinian III, 425–†55, the six-year-old son of the sister of Honorius, was reinstated in his inheritance ; and the West was ruled by his mother, the Empress Galla Placidia, 425–†50, for a quarter of a century. The two chief supports of her throne were Boniface, Count of

¹ Document No. 188.

² *Op.* viii. 1–28 (*P. L.* xlii. 21–50) ; Fleury, xxiv. lxiii, and Document No. 189.

³ *Epp.* ccxxi–ccxxiv (*Op.* ii. 816–20 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 997–1002).

⁴ *Panarion*, *Op.* i, ii. 1–1108 (*P. G.* xli. 173–1200 ; xlii. 1–832).

⁵ *De Haeresibus* (*P. L.* xii. 1111–1302 or *C. S. E. L.* xxxviii).

⁶ For this, and the enormous industry of Augustine as a writer, see *Ep.* ccxxiv, § 2 (*Op.* ii. 820 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1001).

⁷ Gibbon, c. xxxiii (iii. 394 sqq.) ; Hodgkin, i. ii. 844 sqq., ii. 209 sqq.

⁸ Hodgkin, i. ii. 844 : see also Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxii ; Fleury, xxiv. xxxiii.

Africa 422–†32, a friend and correspondent¹ of Augustine, and Aetius, 400–†54, a soldier, born of a barbarian family from Silistria, and now nearest the person of the Augusta as Count of Italy. As might be expected, the two were rivals : not patriots, for then they would have combined to hold the Empire together. As it was, Aetius contrived to bring the Count of Africa into suspicion of disloyalty to the Empress ; and, in 427, to get him declared a public enemy. Boniface, feeling himself too weak to withstand the might of the Empire alone, summoned the Vandals to his aid. They were, at that time, struggling with the Sueves and the Visigoths for the mastery of Spain ; but, attracted by the riches of Africa, they crossed the sea under their young King, Gaiseric, 428–†77, and overran its provinces—all the more readily as Africa was Catholic and they were Arians. Early in 430 three cities only remained inviolate : Hippo, Cirta, and Carthage.² Augustine was consulted by one bishop after another as to whether they should remain at their posts, or take refuge in one of these fortified places, and replied in a letter to Honoratus, bishop of Thiava.³ ‘ Remain with your flocks ’ was his first advice, § 1, ‘ and share their miseries.’ But it was too hard a saying. Some quoted, § 2, ‘ When they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another.’ Others answered, § 5, ‘ What is the good of our remaining simply to see the men slain, the women ravished, the churches burned, and then to be put to the torture ourselves to make us disclose the riches we do not possess ? ’ Augustine relented, § 6, reflecting on the flight of St. Paul from Damascus and of Athanasius from Egypt. He admitted their pleas, § 7, though under limitations. And so it came about that his biographer, Possidius, and other bishops were shut up with him in Hippo when the invaders blockaded the city from May 430 to July 431. In the second month of the siege, Aurelius archbishop of Carthage, died 20 July. In the third month, in the seventy-sixth year of his age and the thirty-fifth of his episcopate, Augustine died,⁴ 28 August 430, his eyes fixed on the penitential psalms and the sounds of a besieging host of Vandals in his ears : taken away, it may well be said, from the evil to come. They

¹ *Epp.* clxxxv, clxxxix, ccxx (*Op.* ii. 643, 697, 812 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 792, 854, 992) ; *Fleury*, xxiii. xxxix–xli, xxiv. lii.

² Possidius, *Vita*, § 28 (*Op.* x, app. 278 c ; *P. L.* xxxii. 58) ; q.v. for the devastation of Africa, *Fleury*, xxv, c. xxv.

³ *Ep.* ccxxviii (*Op.* ii. 830–5 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1013–19) ; tr. Newman, *Ch. F.*, c. xi, and Document No. 190.

⁴ *Fleury*, xxv. xxvi.

offered the Holy Sacrifice at his burial¹; and so passed away the great Doctor of the Church who, more than any other since St. Paul, has shaped the mind of Western Christendom in its thoughts of God and of His dealings by grace with His people. The overstatements of his creed, due to the 'way' in which he himself had been 'led', were 'corrected', as he had prayed, by later 'doctors of the Church'; and where they were cleared away, Augustine, or where they held their ground, Augustinianism, for more than a thousand years reigned supreme over the ideas, theological² and even political,³ of Europe.

We have now to consider the modification of Augustinianism⁴ in Gaul to 529.

§ 8. The last pair of Augustine's extreme treatises may have confirmed Prosper and Hilary in their convictions, but they only served to exasperate the other side. Since the condemnations launched against Pelagianism by Councils and Popes, 417-18, with the support of the East, 420-31, there had come into being a doctrine of Original Sin and the need of Grace which could at last claim to be Catholic. But it was now proposed by Prosper and his friends to add to it certain Augustinian theories about predestination and the distribution of Grace. The proposal was resented. All along the Riviera pamphlets appeared in protest; nine *excerpta* made from the two distasteful treatises by two priests of Genoa, on which they sought Prosper's advice⁵; and *capitula* in two series, one of fifteen collected by Gallic scholars of Provence,⁶ and another of sixteen selected by Vincent of Lerins,⁷ 432. To these, as we have seen, Prosper sent *Responsiones*.⁸ But to no effect. He aimed at passing off as part of the Catholic Doctrine of Sin and Grace the opinions peculiar to the bishop of Hippo, and it was too late openly to succeed in the attempt. Prosper then

¹ Possidius, *Vita*, § 31 (*Op.* x, app. 279 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 63 sq.).

² c. g. over Gottschalk, 805-†69, for whom see J. Sirmondi, *Historia Prædestinatio*, cc. xi, xii (*P. L.* lviii. 689-92), and Mozley, *Aug. Doctr. Pred.* n. xx; St. Thomas Aq., 1225-†74, for whom, as the exponent of Scholastic Augustinianism, see *ibid.*, cc. ix, x, and W. Bright, *Lessons*, app. xxi; J. Calvin, 1509-†64; C. Jansen, bishop of Ypres, 1635-†8, for whom and for the struggles connected with Jansenism, 1642-56, see L. von Ranke, *Hist. Popes*, ii. 396; W. H. Jervis, *Hist. Gall. Ch.*, c. xi; Mozley, 421 sqq.; *Chr. Remembrancer*, xxxi. 193 sq.; W. Bright, *Lessons*, 306 sq.

³ Sir T. Raleigh, *Elementary Politics*, 21, 23.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 264 sqq.; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* lix sqq.; *Lessons*, &c., 302.

⁵ Prosper, *Op.* 241-56 (*P. L.* li. 187-202).

⁶ *Ibid.* *Op.* 203-24 (*P. L.* li. 155-74).

⁷ *Ibid.* *Op.* 227-40 (*P. L.* li. 177-86).

⁸ Fleury, xxvi. xxiv.

abandoned the pen of the pamphleteer for the part of suitor with ecclesiastical authority. Owing to the deaths of Aurelius and Augustine, and to the breakdown of all Church action, Synods included, in Africa, consequent upon the Vandal conquest,¹ it was useless to seek the support of authority there. So to shelter under the authority of the Apostolic See, Prosper went to Rome, c. 431.

§ 9. He got little encouragement from Pope Caelestine,² 422-†32. The Roman See was on good terms with the semi-Pelagians of Provence; so much so that when Leo, now archdeacon of Rome and afterwards Pope, 440-†61, wanted the support of expert theologians against the Nestorians, he sought and obtained it from Cassian,³ *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorianos*,⁴ 430-1. But Caelestine would remember that two years earlier he had been somewhat out of humour with the prelates of those regions; and in *Cuperemus quidem*,⁵ of 26 July 428, had taken them to task, not without a touch of scorn in his reproofs, for abuses alleged to be current among them. 'Some of you, I am told,' he writes, § 2, 'have officiated in church clothed in the unusual garb of cloak and leathern girdle. You allege the command in the Gospel to "have our loins girded about". But, if you are trying to imitate John the Baptist, you are superstitious. We ought to obey Scripture in the Spirit, not in the letter: else why not carry burning lamps and staves in your hands as well? Your garb, no doubt, is excellent for monks and others who dwell in solitary places; but, in church, we bishops wear the ordinary dress of a gentleman. We ought to be distinguished from the people not by dress but by doctrine and manners.' Caelestine's reproof is interesting. It shows, on the unimpeachable evidence of a Pope, that while, as yet, there was, in the West, no specifically liturgical dress for the clergy in church, nevertheless they ordinarily wore chasuble and alb for Sunday clothes as would other gentlemen in their congregation.

¹ On the way in which the Vandal conquest affected the Church, see Victor Vitensis [A. D. 486], *Historia persecutionis Vandalarum* (P. L. lviii. 179-260, or C. S. E. L. vii); and, for criticism and summary, Hodgkin. ii. 265-82.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 148-57.

³ Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, § 61 (P. L. lviii. 1096 A).

⁴ Cassian, *Op.* ii (P. L. l. 9-272); tr. N. and P.-N. F. xi. 551 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xiii. Note i, § 3, where Cassian, like his opponent Prosper, observes the connexion between Pelagianism and Nestorianism, and that you may either start from the first and arrive at the second (P. L. l. 21 A), or reverse the process (ib. 23): see Newman's note in Fleury, iii. 24, note o.

⁵ Caelestine, *Ep.* iv (P. L. l. 430-6); Jaffé, No. 369; Fleury, xxiv. lvi, and Document No. 192.

A couple of hundred years later, gentlemen in the congregation would have been found wearing the tunic and breeches of their barbarian conquerors ; and only the clergy retained the flowing attire of the Roman gentleman¹ which, by this time, was becoming specifically liturgical, though not even to-day specifically sacerdotal² nor specifically eucharistic,³ but traditional and seemly. Seemliness, however, to Caelestine consisted, for the clergy, in not being superstitious and in not being singular, but in behaving like a man of sense and a gentleman. He then goes on, § 3, to correct other things that were amiss, from the same point of view. Do not be too strict in refusing penance *in extremis* ; nor raise to the episcopate, § 4, laymen who have not passed through the inferior grades of the ministry, nor, § 5, criminals ; and, § 7, let not a clerk unknown to the diocese be set in its see to the exclusion of those who have spent their life in its service, for a bishop ought not to be given to an unwilling flock. ' Given ' he must be.⁴ Caelestine takes it for granted that, as in the New Testament, appointment to the ministry is from above : in the case of a bishop, at this date, he is ' given ' by the comprovincials. But he should have the consent of clergy, people and magistrates too. Finally, § 10, I refer to you the case of Venerius, bishop of Marseilles 428-†52 ; he is said to have rejoiced over the murder, two years ago,⁵ of his colleague Patroclus, archbishop of Arles 412-†26. Thus Caelestine had treated, rather disdainfully, on points of discipline, the monastically-minded prelates who, from Lerins and Marseilles, were climbing into possession of the sees of southern Gaul. At the request of Prosper, he was not averse to letting them know his mind again on the point of doctrine. In *Apostolici verba*⁶ of 15 May 431, he wrote to Venerius of Marseilles and others telling them not to let their presbyters preach about subtilties,⁷ and reminding them that Augustine, on the score of his life and his merits, had ever been in communion with the Apostolic See.⁸ Cassian, of

¹ C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches*, 228, n. 1.

² In the *Ordo Romanus* I of A. D. 800 all the clergy from Pope to acolyte enter the church, for the eucharist, in chasubles, though the deacons do not wear theirs during the Mass (§§ 5-7, 8 : ed. C. Atchley, 226-9) ; and, at the present day, folded chasubles are worn by deacon and sub-deacon at certain seasons, *Rubr. Gen.* xix, § 6, and Barbier de Montault, *Le costume et les usages ecclésiastiques selon la tradition romaine*, ii. 86 (Paris, 1898).

³ *Ibid.* ii. 82.

⁴ ' Nullus invitis detur episcopus.'

⁵ Prosper, *Chron.* Op. 743 (*P. L.* li. 594 A).

⁶ *Ep.* xxi (*P. L.* l. 528-37) ; Jaffé, No. 381.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 3.

course, could subscribe to this ; and it was cold comfort to Prosper. The Pope said nothing about Augustine's doctrine ; and Prosper had come to seek support at Rome as an Augustinian loyal on every point save one—that he had adopted predestination to condemnation ' post ' for ' ante praevisa merita vel demerita '.¹ He had hoped to get the Pope to take up his championship of Augustinianism ; and this was all he could obtain. It would even look less than it really was ; for had not Caelestinus aided in the repression of Pelagianism in Britain, 429, and joined in its condemnation at Ephesus, 431, without pledging himself to the system of its only thorough-going opponent, Augustine ?

§ 10. Caelestinus died 27 January 432 ; and, nothing daunted, Prosper would try his successor Sixtus III.,² 432–†40. Sixtus was promising. He had once been the patron of Pelagianism at Rome, but was converted by Augustine. Surely he would do something for Prosper. So, at least, we may suppose Prosper hoped ; since, in his attack on Cassian's thirteenth *Conference*, known as the *Contra Collatorem*, 433–4, he tries to drag Sixtus into the fray, and observes that ' the protection of God, which has wrought in Innocent, Zosimus, Boniface and Caelestinus, will also be found at work in Sixtus. They chased away open wolves ; the present Pope will have the glory of ridding us of wolves in secret. ' ³ Cassian, Vincent, Hilary, and Faustus were the wolves he meant. But Sixtus proved as little inclined as his predecessor to hunt them down ⁴ ; nor did Cassian think it worth while to take up Prosper's challenge.

(1) Vincent, of Lerins, however, put out his *Commonitorium*,⁵ 434,⁶ in reply. His object, as he states, § 1, is to provide himself with a general rule whereby to distinguish Catholic truth from heresy ; and he sets down in writing what he has learnt from the Holy Fathers, that he may have it by him as a commonitory or aid to memory. This rule, § 2, in brief, is the authority of Scripture ; and it would be all-sufficient, but that men differ in the interpretation of Scripture. The rule, therefore, must be supplemented by an

¹ Prosper, *Resp. ad cap. Gall.* iii (*Op.* 207 ; *P. L.* li. 158 c) ; Fleury, xxvi. xxiv ; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 274, 278.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 259 sqq. ; Fleury, xxvi. xv.

³ Prosper, *Contra Collat.* xxi, § 4 (*Op.* 365 ; *P. L.* li. 273 c).

⁴ On the theological position of Cassian contrasted with that of Augustine, see Newman's note in Fleury, iii. 173, note p.

⁵ *P. L.* l. 637–86 ; tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* xi. 131 sqq. ; and ed. R. S. Moxon (Cambr. Patr. Texts), 1915 ; Fleury, xxvi. xxiii ; Newman, *Ch. F.*, c. x, and Document No. 196.

⁶ For the date, *Comm.* ii, § 29 (*P. L.* l. 678).

appeal to that sense of Scripture which is supported by universality, antiquity, and consent; by universality, when it is the faith of the whole Church; by antiquity, when it is that which has been held from the earliest times; by consent, when it has been the acknowledged belief of all, or of almost all, whose office and learning give weight to their determinations. He, then, who would be a Catholic must take care to hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. Origen, § 17, and Tertullian, § 18, are signal instances of the disregard for antiquity and universality; and, § 20, the true Catholic will beware of novelties such as theirs—he does not add, but he means, such as those of Augustine and Prosper also.¹ Is then, § 23, Christian doctrine to remain at a standstill? and is there no room for development in theology as in other sciences? Certainly; but it must be real, and not one-sided, development: such development as is analogous to the growth of the body from childhood to maturity, or of a plant from seed to full-grown tree. It must be an explanatory, not an accretive, development: the elucidation and adaptation of the old, not the addition of anything new. No rule is better known, even where it is held open to criticism, than Vincent's *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*. It is a standard known all the world over. What is less known is that it was a test devised, in the first instance, to rule out the innovations of Augustine and Prosper, though both are unnamed.

(2) As in Gaul, so in Rome, under the archdeacon Leo, there was a strong body of central opinion. They respected the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius, and were careful to render due honour to Augustine. But they were determined not to follow him to the limit of his extreme theories; and made this clear, in a series of writings, all anti-Augustinian, though with praise of Augustine²; and all, it may be, from the same hand,³ viz. of Arnobius Junior, so called to distinguish him from Arnobius of Sicca,⁴ in Proconsular Africa, the author of *Adv. Nationes*, 303–5. These were the *Commentarii in Psalmos*,⁵ the *Praedestinatus*,⁶ c. 440, and the *Conflictus Arnobii catholici cum Serapione Aegyptio*,⁷ after 454. The last of the trio aims at proving the agreement of Rome

¹ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 279.

² e. g. Arnobius, *Conflictus*, ii, § 30 (*P. L.* liii. 314 c, d).

³ So Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 283, n. 1, and Bardenhewer, 604.

⁴ Bardenhewer, 201 sqq.

⁵ *P. L.* liii. 327–570.

⁶ *P. L.* liii. 587–672.

⁷ *P. L.* liii. 239–322.

with the great doctors of Alexandria, and is anti-Monophysite. More important, as indicative of the central position now under review, is the second. Under the form of a history of doctrine, the author gives, in Book I, a catalogue of ninety heresies, plagiarizing largely from Augustine, *De haeresibus*, from Simon Magus to the Predestinarians. No. 88, on Pelagianism, recalls the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius by Pope Innocent ; indicates the chief points of their doctrinal system ; and then the Catholic exceptions to the same. No. 89 deals with Nestorius ; and in No. 90, we arrive at the goal—predestinarianism. It is described at length in Book II, where its salient features are accentuated, in a sermon current under the name of Augustine ; and, in Book III, it is refuted. But so semi-Pelagian is the refutation that the *Praedestinatus* may have emanated from Pelagians in hiding, of whom there were representatives in Rome as in Italy. About 439 Julian of Eclanum made an attempt to recover his see by an address to Pope Sixtus, in which he pretended to have returned to orthodoxy. The archdeacon Leo intervened, and foiled the attempt.¹ It is possible that the *Praedestinatus* was written by a disappointed adherent of Julian to take it out of the ‘ right ’, or Augustinian, wing of the centre party as it had put up Leo to intervene. Be this so or not, Leo was already engaged on formulating a declaration of the anti-Augustinian orthodoxy now dominant, under his leadership, in the Roman Church ; for such, apparently, is the purport of *Praeteritorum sedis Apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei*,² c. 435. On Free-will, on the need of Grace, and on the gift of Perseverance, Leo’s canons maintain the doctrine of Augustine,³ and not of the semi-Pelagians in Provence. Of the irresistibility of Grace, of Predestination, and of the purpose of God to save all, or only a part, of mankind, not merely is nothing said, but such questions are definitely ruled out.⁴ Neither the one side nor the other, neither the semi-Pelagians nor Prosper, ventured a reply. The latter had not been able to obtain a condemnation ; and peace was the result. But not exhaustion. Between 434 and 461 two anonymous writings continued the discussion : the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos* ⁵ and the *De vocatione*

¹ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 439 (*Op.* 747 ; *P. L.* li. 598 A).

² They are appended to Caelestine, *Ep.* xxi, as §§ 4–15 (*P. L.* l. 531–7) : see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 285, and Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 279 sq.

³ e. g. §§ 10, 14.

⁴ Ibid., § 15, and Document No. 197.

⁵ Aug. *Op.* x, app. 1–50 (*P. L.* xlv. 1611–64).

omnium gentium,¹ both from the point of view of a restrained Augustinianism.² Such was, in fact, the official temper of the Roman church at the time.³ Men followed Augustine, but insisted on human freedom ; and, as for the problems of predestination and irresistible Grace, they either dismissed them altogether, or discussed them only with a chastened zeal. So peace reigned till the death of Pope Leo, †461 ; and from his intervention as archdeacon, 435, to the reopening of the question, 475, by Faustus, bishop of Riez 452-†85, the truce was prolonged, and ' the land had rest forty years '.

It was a mere accident that led to the revival of the controversy, and its continuance from 475-525 by Faustus and others.

§ 11. Faustus⁴ had been abbot of Lerins 433-52, and held by the views of Grace that were the rule there. When, therefore, Lucidus, one of his clergy, began to teach predestinarianism, the bishop, finding persuasion useless, demanded that he should either retract his teaching⁵ or be referred to the Council of Arles,⁶ 473. Lucidus assented ; and not only put his hand to a formulary offered for his signature but also wrote a letter to the Council of Lyons,⁷ 474, protesting his loyal adherence to the recent decisions.⁸ So far all was well. But the Synod of Lyons commissioned Faustus to put into literary form its decisions, with those of Arles, on the subjects in dispute⁹ ; and hence his *De Gratia libri duo*.¹⁰ Faustus contented himself with using uncomplimentary language of his fellow-countryman Pelagius (for he, too, was a Briton), but reserved his argument for the destruction of predestinarianism. His point of view was the semi-Pelagianism of Cassian, emphatically repudiating, as he does, prevenient grace.¹¹ The South of Gaul, however, had long been familiar with language of this type ; and, if the book had not found its way to Constantinople, the controversy might have still slept on. But the *De Gratia* there fell into

¹ Prosper, *Op.* 847-924 (*P. L.* li. 647-722).

² Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 281 ; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 286, n. 2.

³ Leo's sermons maintained this temper, Tixeront, iii. 280, n. 58.

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 408 sqq. ; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 609 sqq. ; Bardenhewer, 600 ; and his works in *P. L.* lviii. 775-890, and *C. S. E. L.* xxi.

⁵ By signing six anathematisms, given in Faustus, *Ep.* i (*C. S. E. L.* xxi. 162) ; A. Hahn, *Symbole* ³, § 172 ; Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 282 sq.

⁶ Mansi, vii. 1007 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. 1011 sq.

⁸ Faustus, *Ep.* ii (*C. S. E. L.* xxi. 165) ; Tixeront, iii. 283, n. 66.

⁹ Faustus, *Ep.* i (*P. L.* lviii. 835), and preface to *De Gratia* (*C. S. E. L.* xxi. 3 sq.).

¹⁰ *P. L.* lviii. 783-836, or *C. S. E. L.* xxi. 6-96 ; Tixeront, iii. 284 sqq.

¹¹ e. g. *De Gratia*, i, § 9, ii, § 10 (*C. S. E. L.* xxi. 30, ll. 4 sq., 84, ll. 8 sq.).

the hands of certain Scythian monks who, through Possessor, an African bishop living in exile there, made inquiries of Pope Hormisdas, 514–†23, concerning the weight to be attached to the name of Faustus.¹ The Pope replied, after some delay, 13 August 520, that ‘Faustus was not received’, and that the doctrine of the Church, on the points in question, was to be found indeed, in Augustine, but had been formulated in the ‘canons’ due, as we have seen, to his predecessor St. Leo.² Predestinarians as they were and dissatisfied with this delay, the Scythians addressed themselves, in the meanwhile, c. 519–20, to some refugee bishops from Africa, now resident in Sardinia.³

§ 12. Chief of these was Fulgentius,⁴ bishop of Ruspe 507–†33, in the province of Byzacena. He was an able adversary of Arianism reintroduced into Africa by the Vandals, and a no less skilful exponent of the Augustinian doctrine of Grace. The Scythian monks then frankly adopted in their *Liber ad Fulgentium*⁵ the system of Augustine; and ended by denouncing Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian, with the writings of Faustus as having been unquestionably directed ‘against the opinion of predestination’.⁶ In a series of works, c. 523, Fulgentius took up their quarrel with Faustus; and echoed so faithfully the teaching of Augustine as to have won the title of ‘Augustinus abbreviatus’. He endeavoured, in fact, to crush out the revised semi-Pelagianism of Faustus under the authority of Augustine. But all to no purpose. Faustus had been dead some forty years when Fulgentius thus tried to eradicate his influence. It remained; and the strife between semi-Pelagianism and Augustinianism might have been prolonged indefinitely in the south of Gaul, had it not been for the conciliatory and statesmanlike genius of Caesarius, archbishop of Arles 503–†43.

§ 13. Caesarius⁷ owed his early training to Lerins,⁸ and could well appreciate the distaste for Augustinianism; but, in after days, c. 496–8, and as one of the clergy of his predecessor Aeonius, arch-

¹ ‘Relatio Possessoris Afri,’ *ap.* Hormisdas, *Epp.* (*P. L.* lxiii. 489 sq.)

² Hormisdas, *Ep.* lxx (*P. L.* lxiii. 492 sq.); Jaffé, No. 850.

³ Bardenhewer, 548.

⁴ *Ibid.* 616–18; Tixeront, iii. 287 sqq.; and works in *P. L.* lxv. 151–842.

⁵ = Fulgentius, *Ep.* xvi (*Op.* 277–85; *P. L.* lxv. 442–51).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 28.

⁷ Works in *P. L.* lxvii. 1041–66 and the *Vita* prefixed to them, *ib.* 1001–42; Bardenhewer, 611–13; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* lxiii. sqq.

⁸ *Vita*, i, § 5 (*P. L.* lxvii. 1003 A).

bishop of Arles¹ 493–†502, he had ‘come to love the *Catholic* sentiments of Augustine’,² as he said on his death-bed, but with no liking for extremes. Caesarius was, perhaps, the greatest popular preacher of the ancient Latin church; and he wielded a remarkable influence. But his preaching of Grace rendered him an object of suspicion to certain of the Gallic hierarchy.³ One of them sent him a letter of a semi-Pelagian tone⁴; while bishops of the neighbouring province of Vienne took advantage of a Council at Valence,⁵ 527–8, to invite him to come and clear himself there before them. Caesarius was ill at the time; but sent Cyprian, bishop of Toulon 524–†49, and others to represent him. ‘No man’, said the memorial which Cyprian took with him, ‘can make any progress in the paths of God except he be first called by the grace of God; and a man only resumes his freedom of will when he is redeemed by Christ setting him free.’⁶ So Caesarius foiled the attack for the moment; but it might be repeated. He fortified himself, therefore, with a series of *Capitula*,⁷ or doctrinal propositions from Augustine, which he sent to Pope Felix IV, 528–†30, for approval. Felix modified the document,⁸ and returned it; Caesarius modified it again, when so returned⁹; added to it a doctrinal statement or profession of faith, and then presented it for signature to a gathering of his own at the Council of Orange,¹⁰ 3 July 529. There were only fourteen bishops present, for the consecration of a basilica: himself and his thirteen suffragans. But, thanks to the wisdom of Caesarius in securing first the co-operation,¹¹ and afterwards the confirmation,¹² of the Apostolic See, the decisions of the Council of Orange came to rank, in point of authority, with those of the weightiest synods of the Church. These decisions were twenty-five in number,¹³ and consist either of extracts from Augustine,

¹ *Vita*, §§ 7–10 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 1004 sq.).

² *Ibid.* ii, § 33 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 1041 A).

³ *Ibid.* i, § 46 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 1023 A).

⁴ *Per filium nostrum*, 25 Jan. 531, of Boniface II, *Ep.* i (*P. L.* lxxv. 33 c).

⁵ Mansi, viii. 723 sqq.

⁶ *Vita*, i, § 46 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 1023).

⁷ Mansi, viii. 722–4; nineteen in number.

⁸ He only retained eight, and dropped the rest, esp. Nos. 11–14, relating to predestination and reprobation; but he added sixteen drawn from Prosper’s extracts from Augustine, called his *Sententiae*, viz. Nos. 22, 54, 56, 152, 212, 226, 260, 297, 299, 310, 314, 317, 325, 340, 368, 372: see Prosper, *Op.* 547 sqq. (*P. L.* li. 431 sqq.).

⁹ By introducing a seventeenth, from elsewhere, Co. Orange, c. x.

¹⁰ Mansi, viii. 711 sqq.; Hefele, iv. 152 sqq.; W. Bright, *Anti-P. Tr.* 384 sqq.

¹¹ Jaffé, No. 875.

¹² *Ibid.*, No. 881.

¹³ A. Hahn, *Symbolæ*³, § 174; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, No. xxii, and Document No. 238.

or of statements substantially his. But they skilfully avoid his extreme positions, and fall into three groups. The first group (cc. i, ii) simply affirms the doctrine of the Fall as against Pelagianism, to the effect that, through Adam's sin, our nature as a whole, not the body only but the soul as well, suffered a change for the worse (c. i), and that not only death but sin was transmitted to his posterity (c. ii). The second group consists of six canons (cc. iii-viii) directed against semi-Pelagianism. They insist on Grace as an invariable antecedent to all goodness; Cassian, it will be remembered, having maintained that some people are able to come to God of their own free-will unaided by Grace. For Grace does not wait on prayer, but calls it forth (c. iii); prepares the will (c. iv); sets up the beginnings of faith in the soul (c. v); causes us to seek, ask, and knock (c. vi); nature by itself being so weak (c. vii) and so wounded by the Fall as to be dependent on Grace for its recovery (c. viii). The third group (cc. viii-xxv) contains some striking presentations of profound truths, e.g. 'God loves us not for what we are by our own merits, but for what we are on the way to become by His gift',¹ but is a collection, taken as a whole, of a more miscellaneous character. Its several items, however, are all selected with a view to exhibit the chief aspects of one general principle that man's spiritual activity depends throughout on Grace, as originating, assisting, and sustaining it to the end. Not a word, be it noted, of predestinarianism; and for this reticence, issuing as it did in a clearing of his system from extravagances, Augustine, had he lived, would have had to thank the Roman See, as that See, under Zosimus, had to thank him for saving it from blundering into approval of Pelagianism. So the Church, and neither Pope nor Doctor by himself, has kept the Faith. Finally, the twenty-five canons are followed by a dogmatic statement which puts positively and consecutively what they affirm point by point and negatively. It reaffirms the need of Grace on the ground of the mischief wrought by the Fall, which has 'warped and weakened' the human will for good. Grace, and not nature, was the saving of the fathers of old time; and, since the Advent, Grace has equally been the source of all desire for Baptism. Once this Grace is received in Baptism (not merely the predestinate but) all

¹ 'Tales nos amat Deus quales futuri sumus ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito,' c. xii. This is the truth at the bottom of St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith. It is from Aug. *De Trinitate*, i, § 21 (*Op.* viii 763 F; *P. L.* xlii. 833).

the baptized are capable of fulfilling the conditions of salvation and therefore bound to fulfil them ; and, if there be any who hold that any man is predestined to evil by Divine power—well, we do not believe it, so let him be anathema. The Synod concludes by returning to its immediate object and repeating its condemnation by affirming that faith and love, as well before Baptism as after it, are the result of God's inspiration : the conversion of the Penitent Thief, as of Cornelius and of Zacchaeus, was not of nature but of the gift of God.¹

§ 14. And thus the Church adopted the fundamental position of Augustine, but dismissed his speculations. The doctrine of Grace is the doctrine of the Church. But thanks to its enemies who put in a plea for Nature, it is a doctrine freed from the ruthlessness with which Augustine caused it to be associated, and so rendered at last broadly human.

¹ The reference is due to these cases having been quoted in favour of his own theories by Cassian : see Prosper, *Contra Collat.*, cc. vii, § 3, xvii, § 1 (*Op.* 324, 353 ; *P. L.* li. 231 sq., 261) ; and *Ep. ad Rufinum*, vi, § 7 (*Op.* 91 ; *P. L.* li. 81).

CHAPTER IX

THE CASE OF APIARIUS

WE may now leave the Pelagian controversy and turn our attention Eastwards, where controversies not less grave await it—the Nestorian and the Eutychian. But before we pass from the West, we must go back, for a moment, to the pontificate of Zosimus, 417–†18, and consider the case of Apiarius, 418–26. It is best treated as an appendix to the Pelagian controversy, though it had no connexion with Pelagianism. It raised a different question, on a point not of Faith but of Order: the question of appeal to Rome. But the churches concerned were those of Rome and Africa; and their differences as to the constitution of the Church were raised by the blunders of Zosimus precisely as were their differences about its doctrine—and about the same time.

§ 1. Apiarius,¹ c. 417, was a priest of Sicca Veneria in Africa (now El Kef, some 110 miles south-west of Tunis); and, as a wretched offender, was deposed and excommunicated by his diocesan, Urban, bishop of Sicca,² a friend and pupil of Augustine.³ Apiarius went off straight to Rome to obtain redress from Zosimus. Not that he could not have obtained it at home. For the canon law of Africa repudiated transmarine appeals,⁴ and made ample provision for correcting any miscarriage of justice on the spot. If a grave charge were made against a bishop, twelve of his colleagues were to be assembled to hear it; against a presbyter, six bishops in addition to his own; in the case of a deacon, three.⁵ From this tribunal of first instance the accused might appeal to a Provincial Council presided over by the senior bishop of the Province, who in Africa was Primate thereof: from the Provincial to the Plenary Council of Africa under the Primate of Carthage.⁶ Ample protec-

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 775 sqq.; Fleury, xxiv. vi, x, xi, xxxv; W. Bright, *The Roman See*, 136 sqq.; E. Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 609–23.

² See the Synodal Letter of the Co. of Carthage, 25 May 419 = *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr.*, No. cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 831 A, B).

³ *Ep.* ccxxix, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 836 A; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1019).

⁴ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. cv, c. 11 of the Co. of Carthage of 13 June 407 (Hefele, ii. 443). This *Codex* is a 'dossier constitué en vue de soutenir la thèse africaine sur les appels à Rome', Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 123.

⁵ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. xii (Mansi, iii. 715 B).

⁶ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. xxviii (Mansi, iii. 728 D).

tion was therefore offered in Africa. But to a man with a bad cause, the better the Tribunal on the spot the less he has to hope from it. He is too well known. Apiarius therefore preferred the Court across the sea. Now the Popes—as a rule—with the wisdom that usually characterized the Roman See, had respected the organization of the Church in Africa. But policy and tradition that were native to the ecclesiastical statesmanship of his See were foreign to Zosimus. He took up Apiarius, just as he had taken Pelagius and Caelestius—perhaps to avenge himself on the African episcopate for calling in the Court at Ravenna, to make him reverse his decision in their case. At any rate, he threatened Urban with deposition if he did not retrace his steps, and sent Apiarius back with three legates into Africa, Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, 418–†25, in Picenum, and Philip and Asellus, presbyters, the former of whom was afterwards sent by Pope Caelestine, 422–†32, to represent him, in a similar capacity, at the Council of Ephesus, 431.

In Africa, meanwhile, the reception that awaited the legates of Zosimus had been determined by two Councils.

§ 2. The Council of Carthage, 1 May 418, met the day after the rescript of Honorius had appeared condemning Pelagianism, and declared, in nine canons, the Catholic doctrine of original sin and the need of Grace. In its seventeenth Canon the bishops enacted: ‘If presbyters, deacons, or other inferior clerics complain in any causes that they may have of the judgement of their own bishop, let the neighbouring bishops hear them and settle the dispute. If they should desire to appeal from them, they shall only do so to African Councils or to the Primates of their provinces. But whosoever should think fit to appeal to transmarine Councils may not be received into communion by any one in Africa.’¹ The canon, at first sight, touches only presbyters, as if it were drawn up in view of the case of Apiarius; and it might seem that bishops were not prohibited from making appeal to Rome. But the last clause repeats in quite general terms the standing embargo of the Church of Africa on all such appeals; and that it meant to embrace any case in which a bishop made an appeal of this kind, is clear on the three following grounds.² First, a variant of the Canon in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, 500–c. †550, runs: ‘They shall

¹ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. cxxv (Mansi, iii. 822 D; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 195; E. Tr. ii. 461).

² Denny, *Papalism*, note 47, §§ 1251–2.

not appeal to transmarine judgements but to the Primates of their own provinces, or to a Universal Council, as has often been determined about bishops ; but whosoever, &c.' Next, Zosimus, and finally an African Council in writing to Caelestine, took it as prohibiting the appeal of bishops to Rome, as will be clear, if we proceed.

§ 3. At a small Synod of Caesarea Mauretania,¹ 20 September 418, the legates of Zosimus were received by Aurelius and invited to declare the nature of their commission. They replied, at first, by word of mouth only ; but, pressed for their written instructions, they produced them at last in the shape of a *Commonitorium* in which they were bidden to make four demands : (1) that bishops should have the right of appealing to Rome—clearly Zosimus took the seventeenth canon of Carthage as repudiating such right ; (2) that bishops should be forbidden to go too often to Court—he was thinking, no doubt, of the African intrigues at Ravenna that has recently caused him such humiliation ; (3) that priests and deacons excommunicated by their own bishop should have a right of appeal to neighbouring bishops—and who was nearer neighbour to a bishop of Africa than the bishop of Rome ? ; and (4) that Urban, bishop of Sicca, should be excommunicated or even sent to Rome, if he would not cancel his proceedings in the case of Apiarius.² As to the second and the fourth of these demands, they were easily met. The African episcopate had already legislated against going off to Court on frivolous pretences³ ; and Urban was perfectly ready to withdraw any decision of his that was reasonably open to criticism.⁴ Moreover, the third requirement had long ago been conceded⁵ ; though what had it to do with the case in question, unless the diocese of Sicca was adjacent to the diocese of Rome ? But along with the first it was pressed upon the attention of the Africans ; and in support of these two demands, Zosimus referred them to the fifth⁶ and the fourteenth⁷ Canon of Sardica respectively : quoting these, however, not as Sardican

¹ So Van Espen, in his 'Dissertatio in Synodos Africanas', x, § 3 (*Op.* iii. 273 : Lovanii, 1758) ; C. M. is now Algiers.

² Letter of the Co. of Carthage of 25 May 419 = *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 830 sq.).

³ A. D. 407, *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. cvi (Mansi, iii. 807).

⁴ Ibid., No. cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 831 B)

⁵ Ibid., No. xxviii (Mansi, iii. 728 D).

⁶ Hefele, ii. 120 ; and, as quoted by Zosimus, see Mansi, iv. 404.

⁷ Hefele, ii. 148 ; and, as quoted by Zosimus, see Mansi, iv. 405 sq.

but as 'Nicene'.¹ Naturally, the Africans were unable to find them in the copy of the Acts of Nicaea which had been brought back with him by Caecilian, Archbishop of Carthage, 311-†45. They were also unable to meet the assertion of Zosimus that 'so they said at the Council of Nicaea' by pointing out that what he attributed to the Fathers of Nicaea was really a Canon of Sardica: for they did not know the true history of Sardica, and, confusing it with the secessionist *Conciliabulum* at Philippopolis, were wont to think of it as an Arian synod.² So they simply wrote to Zosimus and said that, pending investigation, they would observe 'the two pretended canons of Nicaea', without prejudice. But the letter never reached him. His tactlessness embroiled him, as with the Africans, so with his clergy at Rome. They denounced him to the Court at Ravenna, and he was actually proceeding to their excommunication,³ 3 October 418, when he fell sick and, after a lingering illness,⁴ died 27 December of the year that cost him so many mortifications. Zosimus, it must be owned—and he himself, as he lay hovering between life and death, may have felt it—was not a success; and the resentments he had aroused flamed up into a contest for his vacant throne between his archdeacon Eulalius⁵ and the majority of the Roman presbyterate.⁶ The presbyters stood for one of their colleagues, Boniface—a priest of years and experience, the friend of Augustine⁷ and the trusted agent⁸ of Zosimus' wiser predecessor, Innocent I. Honorius at length, instructed by Galla Placidia,⁹ banished Eulalius and installed Boniface, Easter, 419; and it was the latter who thus came to be concerned with the second stage of the case of Apiarius.

§ 4. This was opened up at the Council of Carthage,¹⁰ 25 May 419. The legates of Zosimus remained at Carthage during the contested election of his successor. Their errand was at a standstill; for

¹ 'Ita dixerunt in concilio Nicaeno' are his words, Mansi, iv. 404 A. There is no reason to doubt his good faith: see Hefele, ii. 464, n. 1.

² e. g. *Aug. Ep.* xlv, § 6 (*Op.* ii. 103 F; *P. L.* xxxiii. 176).

³ *Zos. Ep.* xiv (*P. L.* xx. 678-80); Jaffé, No. 345.

⁴ *Coll. Avell.*, No. 14 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 59).

⁵ Fleury, xxiv. vii-ix.

⁶ The documents relating to this contested election are in *Coll. Avell.*, Nos. 14-36 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 59-82).

⁷ He addressed to Boniface his *Contra duas epp. Pel.*

⁸ Palladius, *Vita*, § 4 (*Op.* xiii. 13 A; *P. G.* xlvii. 15).

⁹ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 250.

¹⁰ For the *acta* of this synod see Mansi, iv. 401-15, and 419 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, ii. i. 198 sqq.; ii. 465, E. Tr.; and for its Synodal Letter, *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, No. cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 830 sqq.); Fleury, xxiv. x, xi.

the African episcopate had to consider whether its provisional answer was to hold good permanently. And this was the business of the plenary council, of two hundred and seventeen bishops, that now met under Aurelius, the Primate of Carthage.¹ On the motion of the president the copy of the Nicene Acts preserved at Carthage was read²: then, on the demand of Faustinus,³ the *Commonitorium* of Zosimus.⁴ But the reading of these instructions was interrupted by Alypius, bishop of Tagaste, as soon as the first of the two Canons alleged to be Nicene had been recited.⁵ 'I don't know how it is,' said he, 'but we did not find those words anywhere in our copies of the minutes of Nicaea'; and he moved that as the original acts were understood to be at Constantinople, Aurelius should write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and ask for authentic copies.⁶ Faustinus objected: let the Synod write to the Pope and ask him to institute the inquiry.⁷ But this would have been to place the decision in the hands of a party to the dispute; and, taking no notice of the opposition of the papal legate, the Council resolved that a copy of the Acts of Nicaea, as recited, together with the enactments of former African Councils (including, therefore, the seventeenth canon of the previous Council of Carthage now in question), should be added to the minutes of the Synod⁸; and that Aurelius should write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain from them copies of the genuine Acts of Nicaea. If, then, the Canons which Zosimus alleged were found in these Acts, they were to be observed; but if not, the matter should be considered further in Synod.⁹ Meanwhile, they were to be observed *ad interim*, and, of course, 'what was decided at Nicaea has the approval of the Council'¹⁰—an important affirmation on the part of the Africans, for hereby they made quite clear the grounds on which they were making the present concession, and at the same time reserved their liberty of action for the future.¹¹ As for

¹ Aurelius presided, along with Valentine, primate of Numidia; next was seated Faustinus, the papal legate; then the bishops; then the other two papal legates who were only presbyters, Mansi, iv. 402 B.

² *Acta*, § 1 (Mansi, iv. 402 sq.).

³ *Acta*, § 2 (403 c.).

⁴ *Acta*, § 3 (403 sq.).

⁵ *Acta*, § 3 (404, A B).

⁶ *Acta*, § 4 (404 D).

⁷ *Acta*, § 5 (405 B).

⁸ Accordingly the Creed (*Acta*, § 10; Mansi, iv. 407 sq.) and the Canon, of Nicaea (ib. 407–15) follow here.

⁹ *Acta*, § 9 (Mansi, iv. 406 sq.).

¹⁰ *Acta*, § 7 (Mansi, iv. 406 B).

¹¹ Before adjourning, the Council made six canons relating to accusations against the clergy, *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, cc. 128–33 (Mansi, iii. 826 sq.).

Apiarius, he made full confession of his offences; while Urban, his bishop, corrected some informalities of the sentence against him, and the offender was allowed to officiate anywhere but at Sicca.¹ A Committee was appointed, Augustine being one of its members,² to draft a letter to Pope Boniface, 418-†22, in pursuance of the resolutions.³ He was requested to write for himself to the Eastern prelates in whose churches 'the truest copies'⁴ of the Nicene Canons would naturally be found; but if, on inquiry, the alleged Canons should prove to be Nicene and to be observed as Nicene in Italy, 'we will mention them no more and will make no difficulty about allowing them. Such arrogance, however, as that of Faustinus we do not expect to have to put up with again': and they took care quietly to preclude any possibility of misinterpretation of the word 'neighbouring' by taking it for granted that it must refer 'to the bishops of the Provinces' of Africa.⁵ We may observe, in passing, that, in this letter of Augustine and others on behalf of the African episcopate, there is no recognition, on their part, of any authority over them belonging to the Pope, save such as can be found in the legislation of Nicaea; while Zosimus himself, in seeking to base his action on Nicene enactments, offers testimony, for his part, equally incompatible with the later theory of papalism. He claims no inherent, but only a delegated, authority. Even this claim turned out to be ill-founded. Of the deputation to Antioch we know nothing; but the replies from Atticus of Constantinople⁶ and Cyril of Alexandria⁷ are still extant; and so is the Latin version, known as 'Attici', made at Constantinople for comparison with the 'Vetus' or 'Caeciliani' brought back to Carthage by that prelate. Needless to say, the Canons in question were conspicuous by their absence; and the Africans simply contented themselves by forwarding the documents to Boniface, 26 November 419,⁸ as if the incident were closed.

§ 5. It was reopened, for its third and final stage, under Pope Caelesthine, 422-†32. Apiarius had taken up work in Tabraca,⁹

¹ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 831 B).

² *Ibid.* cxxvii (Mansi, iii. 823 B, C).

³ For this letter, *Quoniam Deo placuit*, see *ibid.* cxxxiv (Mansi, iii. 830-5).

⁴ Mansi, iii. 834 E.

⁵ *Ibid.* 835 E.

⁶ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* cxxxvi (Mansi, iii. 838) = Atticus, *Ep.* (P. G. lxxv. 649 sq.).

⁷ *Ibid.* cxxxv (Mansi, iii. 835 sq.) = Cyril *Ep.* lxxxv (*Op.* x; P. G. lxxvii. 377).

⁸ *Ibid.* cxxxviii (Mansi, iii. 842 D).

⁹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 860.

a city on the coast not far from Hippo. But meanwhile, in another city of that diocese, named Fussala,¹ a centre of Donatism,² Augustine, with the consent of the Primate of Numidia, had set up a young friend of his as bishop, named Antony, because he could talk in Punic, the language of the district.³ Antony's rule was oppressive. He was more zealous to shear his sheep than to feed them; and by Augustine and a Council of bishops he was deprived of his see, but not deposed from the episcopate.⁴ Antony thereupon hastened to Rome; and, armed with a letter of recommendation from the Primate who must have been a dotard,⁵ procured from Pope Boniface orders for his reinstatement, 'if he have faithfully described the state of the case'.⁶ Returning to Africa, he flourished the document there, and threatened to call in the secular arm for his restoration.⁷ It was too much for Augustine; and, after taking measures to win over the Primate, he sent to Caelestine a *dossier* of the case, with a letter⁸ detailing what had happened. He congratulates Caelestine on his peaceable accession,⁹ and not without reason. Boniface, after an illness, had written to the Emperor warning him that the old rivalries between sections of his flock were ready to break out again into schism upon his death¹⁰; whereupon Honorius replied that, should there be rival claimants again for the see, his government would see to it that neither candidate should be allowed to succeed.¹¹ And this may account for the peaceable succession of Caelestine. To his congratulations Augustine appended an earnest supplication. Let not the Pope countenance the employment of the police to enforce the rulings of the Apostolic See; should such a wrong be done to the people of Fussala and Antony be thrust once more upon them, he himself would have to resign his bishopric.¹² We know no more of Fussala; but probably Augustine's respectful but urgent outspokenness prevailed with Caelestine; for we find the Church there ruled from Hippo within a short time of Augustine's death.¹³ But the Africans did not forget the incident when

¹ On this affair see Aug. *Ep.* ccix [A. D. 423] (*Op.* ii. 777-80; *P. L.* xxxiii. 953-6); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 836 sqq.; Fleury, xxiv. xxxiv.

² Aug. *Ep.* ccix, § 2.

³ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, §§ 4, 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁸ *Ep.* ccix (*ut sup.*).

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 1.

¹⁰ Boniface, *Ep.* vii, of 1 July 420 (*P. L.* xx. 765 sq.); Jaffé, No. 353.

¹¹ *Coll. Avell.*, No. 37 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 83), and Document No. 153.

¹² Aug. *Ep.* ccix, § 10 (*Op.* ii. 780; *P. L.* xxxiii. 956).

¹³ *Ep.* ccxxiv, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 819 f; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1001).

the case of Apiarius came up again. At Tabraca his conduct proved a repetition of the offences that had caused his removal from Sicca. He was excommunicated: appealed once again to Rome, and was received by Caelestine who, without hearing his accusers, restored him to communion, and sent him back to Africa accompanied, as before, by Faustinus, the legate whom the Africans had found so overbearing. A Council (the twentieth) of Carthage, 424, was summoned to consider the situation.¹ Faustinus asserted the privileges of the Roman church, and demanded that the decision of the Apostolic See should be accepted as final. But the Africans did not take this view of their liberties. They spent three days in examining for themselves into the conduct of Apiarius at Tabraca, Faustinus the while trying to obstruct the inquiry and Apiarius to cover himself by evasion. At last, however, the miserable creature broke down and confessed his enormities.² The legate was baffled; and the bishops, seizing their advantage, wrote to Caelestine an account of their proceedings in their Synodal Letter.

It is the famous document, so unwelcome to papalists, beginning *Optaremus*.³ 'We could wish that, like as your Holiness intimated to us, in your letter sent by our fellow-priest Leo, your pleasure at the arrival of Apiarius, so we also could send you these writings with pleasure, respecting his clearing of himself.'⁴ They then detail the inquiry to the point of the breakdown of Apiarius,⁵ and continue: 'Premising, therefore, our due regards to you, we earnestly implore you that, for the future, you do not readily admit to a hearing persons coming hence, nor choose to receive to your communion those who have been excommunicated by us, because your Reverence will readily perceive that this has been prescribed by the Nicene Council. For, though this seems to be there forbidden in respect of the inferior clergy or the laity, how much more did the Council will this to be observed in the case of bishops, lest those who had been suspended from communion in their own province might seem to be restored hastily or unfitly by your Holiness? Let your Holiness reject, as is worthy of you, that unprincipled taking shelter with you of presbyters likewise and inferior clergy, both because by no ordinance of the Fathers hath

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 860-6; Fleury, xxiv. xxxv; Hefele, ii. 480 sq.

² *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* cxxxviii (Mansi, iii. 839).

³ *Ibid.* (Mansi, iii. 839-44).

⁴ *Ibid.* (839 B).

⁵ *Ibid.* (839-42 A).

the Church of Africa been deprived of this right, and the Nicene Decrees have most plainly committed not only the clergy of inferior rank but the bishops themselves to their own metropolitans. For they have ordained with great wisdom and justice that all matters should be terminated where they arise; and they did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any province for the priests of Christ [*i.e.* the bishops] wisely to discern and firmly to maintain that which is right, especially since whosoever thinks himself wronged by any judgement may appeal to the Council of his province or even to a general Council [*sc.* of all Africa], unless it be imagined that God can inspire a single individual with justice and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of priests [*i.e.* bishops] assembled in Council. And how shall we be able to rely on a sentence passed beyond the sea, since it will not be possible to send thither the necessary witnesses, whether from weakness of sex or of advanced age or any other impediment. For that your Holiness should send any [*sc.* legate] on your part, we can find ordained by no Council of the Fathers. Because with regard to what you have sent us by our brother-bishop Faustinus, as being contained in the Nicene Council, we can find nothing of the kind in the more authentic copies of that Council, which we have received from the holy Cyril, our brother-bishop of the Alexandrine Church and from the venerable Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, and which we formerly sent by Innocent the presbyter and Marcellus the sub-deacon, through whom we received them, to Boniface, the bishop, your predecessor of venerable memory. For the rest, whosoever desires you to delegate any of your clergy to execute your orders'—here they are referring to a memorial of the people of Fussala, which was supported by Augustine's covering letter and deprecated Caelestine's complying with a request to reinstate their bishop Antony—'do not comply: lest it seem that *we* are introducing the pride of secular dominion [*"we"* that we say not *"you"*: they mean coercive powers placed at the disposal of the Roman see by such rescripts as those of Valentinian I and Gratian] into the Church of Christ, which exhibits before those who desire to see God the light of simplicity and the splendour of humility; for, now that the miserable Apiarius has been removed out of the Church of Christ for his horrible crimes, we feel confident respecting our brother Faustinus that, through the uprightness and moderation of your Holiness, our brotherly charity not being violated,

Africa will by no means any longer be forced to endure him. And so, Sir and Brother, may our Lord long preserve your Holiness to pray for us.' ¹

§ 6. We may, in conclusion, consider the bearing of this letter on the theory of the constitution of the Church. 'The Africans maintained: (1) that the bishop of Rome had no right to receive to communion bishops or others excommunicated by the bishops of Africa; (2) that the Provincial Synod was the appointed tribunal of appeal, subject to a Plenary Council of Africa; (3) that transmarine appeals were illegal, for the Nicene Council had ordered [c. 5] that all causes should be terminated where they arose; (4) that an Oecumenical Council is the supreme authority; (5) that the canons which Caelestine and his predecessors had asserted to be Nicene were not authentic; (6) that the legatine system is not to be tolerated; (7) that Faustinus, in particular, was not wanted. Both the tone and the contents of the letter are incompatible with papalism: it could never have been written by a body of men who held that the papal sovereignty was of divine institution: it is proof positive that such sovereignty was 'not—to use the phrase of Leo XIII in *Satis cognitum* of 28 June 1896—"the venerable and constant belief" of the "age" of the African episcopate at the time when St. Augustine was its most distinguished ornament.' ² But the hour of that episcopate had nearly struck: the Vandal conquest wrecked it: and, with the disappearance of synodal action in Africa, the field was left free, in the West, for papalism to build on the ruins of the old Conciliar Constitution of the Church.

¹ *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* (842 sq.), and Document No. 154.

² E. Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 621-2.

CHAPTER X

THE EAST UNDER THEODOSIUS II, 408-†50

I. THE GREAT SEES. II. MONASTICISM

IN the first half of the reign of Theodosius II the government was in the hands of his minister, Anthemius, 408-14; and, after him, of the Emperor's sister, Pulcheria.

I

At this time there sat in the great sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, Atticus, Cyril, and Alexander. They were men of very different character. The memory of Chrysostom was the question that brought them into contact, sometimes into collision, with each other; and all three, ultimately, to a renewal of communion with the see of Rome, which had steadily supported Chrysostom with the authority of the West.

§ 1. Atticus,¹ bishop of Constantinople 406-†25,² was a man of great ability³; kind, courtly, and scholarly⁴; no persecutor,⁵ though deeply pledged against the memory of John. He was a fair preacher; though not (said the tradition of the capital, with John, of course, in mind) of the sort to have his sermons received with applause or taken down in shorthand.⁶ Full of sympathy with the afflicted, Atticus succoured Christian refugees,⁷ c. 420, from the persecution newly broken out in Persia in the last year of Iazdgerd I, 399-†420.⁸ He sent money to the famine-stricken people of Nicaea, with instructions that it was to be used in relief of the poor and not of professional beggars: and, further, that in its

¹ Soz. *H. E.* viii. xxvii, §§ 3-7; Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 416-33.

² d. 8 Oct. 425, acc. to Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 313.

³ Socr. *H. E.* vi. xx, § 3, vii. ii, § 1, xxv, § 1.

⁴ Ibid. vii. ii, §§ 3, 4.

⁵ Ibid., § 2.

⁶ Ibid., § 7.

⁷ Ibid. vii. xviii, § 3.

⁸ Acc. to Socr. *H. E.* vii. xviii, § 1 he was no persecutor; but this must be corrected by the *Passions* of 'Abdā, 31 March 420 (Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxix), and of Narsai, 420; for which see J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse*, 105-9. Iazdgerd I, however, only punished individuals. A general persecution (Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 356-63) broke out under his son Bahram V, and had been going for thirty years when Thdt. (v. xxxix, § 5) wrote in 450, with an interval after the peace of 422 (Socr. *H. E.* vii. xx, §§ 12, 13) between Rome and Persia.

distribution no account was to be taken of religious opinion, only of need and character.¹ He protected the Novatianists at Constantinople, when asked by the orthodox to suppress them.² He even succeeded in rallying to the Church a number of Joannites. But his own churches in the city were thinly attended, while their assemblies in the suburbs were thronged; and bishops, as well as the populace, stood out in loyalty to John.³ Before his death Atticus gave way, under pressure from the peacemaker, Alexander, bishop of Antioch⁴; and was succeeded by Sisinnius, 426–†7, the priest of a suburban church. Sisinnius had all the kindliness of Atticus, without his ability.⁵ He consecrated the orator, Proclus, secretary of Atticus, to be bishop of Cyzicus,⁶ and thrust him on its people without election. They resented the imposition; and Proclus, destined hereafter for eminence as theologian and as bishop of Constantinople, 434–†46, lived on for the present in the capital: where, by his preaching and his goodness, he won all hearts. After a brief episcopate Sisinnius died, 427.⁷ A contest seemed imminent for the succession. One aspirant was Philip of Side in Pamphylia, a scholar-priest of whose *Historia Christiana*, published in 430, Socrates has but a sorry, though probably just, opinion. He says it is a long and rambling work.⁸ The friends of Proclus put him forward also. To quash the rivalry the Emperor stepped in, and appointed Nestorius.⁹ He was born at Germanicia, but baptized and educated at Antioch, where, as a preacher with a fine voice and a fluent delivery,¹⁰ and as head of a monastery near the city,¹¹ he was a priest of some distinction.

§ 2. At this time Alexander was bishop of Antioch,¹² 413–†21. He succeeded Porphyrius, a scoundrel according to Palladius, but, in the eyes of Theodoret, who is a better authority for Antiochene affairs, a munificent¹³ and capable ruler. Not the ruler but the devout ascetic shone in Alexander. He was a great teacher too,

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxv, §§ 3–8.

² *Ibid.*, § 15.

³ Cyril, *Ep.* lxxv (*Op.* x. 202; *P. G.* lxxvii. 349 B).

⁴ *Ibid.* (*Op.* x. 202 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 349 sqq.); Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxv, § 2; Fleury, xxiii. xxvii.

⁵ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxvi; Fleury, xxiv. xlv.

⁶ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xli, § 1; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 704–19.

⁷ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxviii.

⁸ *Ibid.* vii. xxvii.

⁹ *Ibid.* vii. xxix; Fleury, xxiv. lv.

¹⁰ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxix, § 2; Thdt. *Haer. Fab. Comp.* iv, § 12 (*Op.* iv. 369; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 433 A, B).

¹¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* i, § 7 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2436).

¹² Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxv; Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 650 sqq.; Fleury, xxiii. xxvi.

¹³ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxv, § 2.

whose teaching was commended by his life not less than by fluency of speech. So says Theodoret¹: and Cyril grudgingly allows that Alexander had 'the gift of the gab'.² But his eloquence drew its persuasiveness from his character of peace-maker.

(1) He was the means of finally healing the Antiochene schism; for he went to the church of the Eustathians, carried the congregation off in joint-procession with his own people to the Cathedral,³ and afterwards received into the ranks of the clergy of Antioch all those who had been ordained by Paulinus, 362-†88, and Evagrius,⁴ 388-†92.

(2) He caused the diptychs of his church to be enriched by the name of St. John Chrysostom⁵; acknowledged as bishops two of his adherents, Elpidius of Laodicea, and Pappus⁶; and sent envoys to Pope Innocent, who should acquaint him with these happy tidings and desire his communion. The request was supported by Cassian, 360-†435, a disciple of Chrysostom, then living at Rome, and gladly acceded to by Innocent in synod. In the Synodal Letter, *Apostolici favoris*, c. 415, the Pope 'welcomes the communion of the church of Antioch'.⁷ He followed up his official communication by a note to Alexander—*Quam grata mihi*⁸—to tell him how pleased he was with his deputies. Then he sent off *Ecclesia Antiochena*⁹ to Boniface, afterwards his successor, but now his representative in Constantinople, to let him know of the peace at last reigning between the two sees of Peter. We may note in passing this evidence for the now ruling theory of a Petrine hierarchy. At the same time Acacius of Beroea, 381-†437, one of Chrysostom's most implacable opponents,¹⁰ wrote for reconciliation to Innocent: he approved, he said, of all that Alexander had done. But it was no genuine offer, as will presently appear from a letter of Cyril to Atticus¹¹; and Innocent may have

¹ Thdt. *H. E.*, §§ 2, 3. ² *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* x. 207; *P. G.* lxxvii. 357 B).

³ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxv, §§ 3, 4.

⁴ Innocent, *Ep.* xix, § 1 (*P. L.* xx. 541 A); Jaffé, No. 305.

⁵ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxv, § 5. The diptychs, acc. to Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v. *Δίπτυχα*, were of three classes: D. virorum (eminent living persons, kings, benefactors, &c.); D. episcoporum (the roll of saints canonized); D. mortuorum (the roll of the faithful departed). For their place in the rite see Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 85.

⁶ Innocent, *Ep.* xix, § 1 (*P. L.* xx. 541 B).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 1 (*P. L.* xx. 542).

⁸ *Ep.* xx (*P. L.* xx. 543); Jaffé, No. 306.

⁹ *Ep.* xxiii (*P. L.* xx. 546 sq.); Jaffé, No. 309.

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 219-27.

¹¹ *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* x. 207; *P. G.* lxxvii. 357 B, c).

suspected as much. He replied in *Ad gaudere litteras*,¹ and contented himself with referring Acacius to Alexander. He would receive Acacius into communion on condition that he first satisfied the bishop of Antioch.

(3) A third letter of Innocent to Alexander is of more permanent interest than the correspondence that passed between them over the rehabilitation of John. It begins *Et onus et honor*,² and touched four points of importance, some of them in answer to questions which Alexander had addressed to the Pope. A difficulty had arisen in the island of Cyprus where the bishops, 'distressed',³ as Innocent says, by the dominance of Arianism at Antioch, had disregarded the sixth canon of Nicaea by filling up sees on their own authority, without reference to Alexander or his predecessors.

(a) The primary question, then, was as to the basis of 'patriarchal' authority; and it is answered, though in an *obiter dictum*, by appeal to the theory which was first officially put forth under Pope Damasus, and now reigned at Rome, that Peter was bishop, and not merely founder, of Antioch first and of Rome afterwards. Accordingly, says Innocent, the Nicene Council gave an authority to Antioch extending 'not only over one province but over a whole diocese; and this honour was assigned to it not so much for the greatness of the city, as because it was the first see of the first of the Apostles; and it would not yield even to Rome were it not that it only enjoyed for a time him whom Rome possessed to the end'.⁴ The Damasine theory, thus adopted by Innocent, is an unhistorical one. Origen is the first to assert that Peter was bishop of Antioch⁵; the Canon of the Mass makes it clear that he did not rank as bishop of Rome⁶; while, if the patriarchal system⁷ had its roots in the personal history of St. Peter, then, though Innocent could, on this showing, easily explain why Antioch, the Apostle's 'first see', should rank after his final see of Rome, he would have been hard put to it to say why Antioch, the see of the master, should rank, as it actually did, third among the great sees of Christendom at Nicaea, and not take precedence of Alexandria, the see of St. Peter's disciple Mark.⁸ The truth is, that

¹ *Ep.* xxi (*P. L.* xx. 543 sq.); Jaffé, No. 307.

² *Ep.* xxiv (*P. L.* xx. 547-51); Jaffé, No. 310; Fleury, xxiii. xxvi.

³ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 1.

⁵ *Hom. vi in Luc.* (*Op.* iii. 938; *P. G.* xiii. 1815 A).

⁶ In 'Communicantes,' &c.

⁷ On this new development of the hierarchy [viz. the Patriarchal System] see Fleury, ii. 270, note i.

⁸ C. H. Turner in *C. M. H.* i. 173.

neither the civil pre-eminence of a city which was what gave rank to a see in the East, nor the Apostolic origin of the see which was the standard of a bishop's dignity in the West, was the sole factor in determining the hierarchy of place among bishops, as it actually worked out.¹

(b) Accordingly, when Alexander went on to ask whether ecclesiastical arrangements should necessarily follow the civil divisions of the Empire, his question and Innocent's answer afford an excellent instance of the way in which the Eastern and the Western mind differed. When Valens erected part of Cappadocia into a distinct province, Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, contended 'that the ecclesiastical divisions should follow the civil'.² Basil resisted for a time, but was eventually obliged to give way.³ The custom established itself: the metropolitan was simply the bishop who presided over the city which was a metropolis in the civil sense; and the convenience of the arrangement was, no doubt, the reason for its reaffirmation from time to time as by the Council of Chalcedon,⁴ 451, and the Quinisext or Council in Trullo,⁵ 692. The simplicity of the rule was its recommendation. When a city became important in secular affairs, then, automatically, its bishop ceased to be subject to the prelate of a place ecclesiastically more venerable, perhaps, but practically of less account. And even in the West the principle took effect. 'Thus "in the seventh century Seville lost the primacy of Spain to Toledo as the residence of the Visigothic kings" ⁶; thus, after the breaking up of the kingdom of Aquitaine in the twelfth century, first one, and then another, great see shook off the authority of the primatial church of Bourges ⁷; and thus Paris, for many ages a suffragan see of Sens, became at last, in 1622, an Archbishopric.'⁸ But Innocent, who, like Damasus, would with justice oppose the opinion that Rome and the other patriarchates—save Constantinople—owed their pre-eminence simply to the civil dignity of their cities, laid down, in response to Alexander's query, the opposite principle, based on the precedent set by Damasus in regard to Eastern Illyricum:

¹ For this hierarchy and the causes which shaped it, see Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, c. i.

² Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xliii, § 58 (*Op.* ii. 813; *P. G.* xxxvi. 572 A).

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* ix. 176 sqq.

⁴ Chalc., c. 17; W. Bright, *Canons* ², xliv.

⁵ Canon 38; Hefele, v. 229.

⁶ J. M. Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology*, 290.

⁷ *Ibid.* 291.

⁸ W. Bright, *Canons* ², 201

'It does not seem fitting that the Church of God should change her course to suit the shifting requirements of worldly governments. If, therefore, a province be divided into two parts by the Emperor, it ought not to have two metropolitans; but to keep to its ancient custom.'¹ But suppose part of an ecclesiastical province was detached from its former sovereign, and incorporated into another kingdom—as Northumbria, between the Tweed and the Firth of Forth, passed from England to Scotland—what then? On Innocent's principle the claims of the Archbishopric of York to metropolitan authority over Scotland, at least as far as that tract of country was concerned, held good²; and the Lowland bishops, at any rate, ought to have continued their obedience to York. But to this the clergy of the days of Alexander I of Scotland, 1107–†24, objected.³ On the other hand, when in 1266 territories included in the diocese of Sodor and Man (i.e. the Isle of Man⁴ and the Sudereys,⁵ or Hebrides; Orkney and Shetland being the 'North Isles') were ceded by Magnus VI of Norway, 1263–†81, to Alexander III of Scotland, 1249–†86, the ecclesiastical rights of the Archbishop of Trondhjem were expressly reserved⁶: while the first Scottish archbishopric was erected not in Edinburgh but at St. Andrew's,⁷ 1472, and London continues to this day in subjection to Canterbury.

(c) In reply to Alexander's question as to the extent of the authority of Antioch over Cyprus, Innocent proceeded to apply his theory of the Petrine hierarchy. He held that the Cypriot bishops, in filling up sees without reference to the bishops of Antioch, had disregarded the sixth canon of Nicaea. The Council had, in his view, established the authority of 'the first' of Peter's two sees over a whole 'diocese' or group of provinces. The Cypriot bishops should, therefore, procure Alexander's approval for episcopal consecrations within their own island. Alexander should not only consecrate metropolitans, but his assent should be a necessary preliminary to the appointment of simple bishops⁸

¹ *Ep.* xxiv, § 2 (*P. L.* xx. 548 sq.).

² A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Doc.* ii. 260, note a.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 170; G. Grub, *Eccl. Hist. Scotland*, i. 206 sq.

⁴ Man was transferred to York, 1458, by Calixtus III, 1455–†8.

⁵ The 'Sudereys' or 'The Isles' was made independent of Trondhjem, c. 1472, and afterwards made suffragan to the archbishopric of Glasgow, which was constituted 1479: see R. L. Poole, *Hist. Atlas of Modern Europe*, Map xxvi.

⁶ Grub, i. 327.

⁷ *Ibid.* 376.

⁸ *Ep.* xxiv, §§ 1, 3 (*P. L.* xx. 548 sq.).

—a rule, says Tillemont, which ‘gave a great authority to patriarchs and enfeebled the authority of metropolitans’.¹ But Innocent’s decision was not maintained. The Council of Ephesus, 431, dealt with the question of the *Ius Cyprium* from a different point of view, and decided for the Cypriots, though provisionally. ‘If it has not been a continuous custom for the bishop of Antioch to hold ordinations in Cyprus, the island shall be free.’² The claims of Antioch³ turned out to be due to the purely secular circumstance of the prefect of Cyprus being appointed by the *dux* of Antioch; and owing to the opportune discovery, c. 488, of the body of St. Barnabas in the soil of his native island,⁴ the ‘autocephalous’ position of the Cypriot church was recognized by the Council in Trullo,⁵ 692, and remains to this day. It is a standing reminder that neither the civil rank of a city nor the Apostolic connexions of a see, neither the favourite Eastern nor the prevalent Western principle, has by itself, or in conjunction with its rival principle, sufficed to create the hierarchical arrangements of Christendom as we know them to-day.

(d) Finally, as Arianism died hard, Alexander had doubted how to deal with Arian clergy who came over to the Church. Innocent replied: ‘As on the principle that is now the accepted rule in the case of lay converts from heresy.’ Such persons were acknowledged as baptized, but they were required to submit to Confirmation, for in their heresy they could not have ‘received the Holy Spirit’. In the same way clerical converts ought not to be recognized as having received the Holy Spirit in ordination, but should take rank as simple laymen⁶—a decision which later ecclesiastical law has in effect set aside. So ended this most instructive correspondence of Alexander with Innocent.

(4) Dismissing from his mind his own difficulties with Cyprus, Alexander returned to the task of making peace over the memory of Chrysostom, and went to Constantinople to urge the people to demand of Atticus the restoration of his predecessor’s name to the diptychs.⁷ He had no success with Atticus, who would not yield,

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 655.

² Co. Eph., c. 8; W. Bright, *Canons* ², xxix sq., 135 sqq.

³ Discussed in Fleury, ii. 114, note i.

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 447, xvi. 380.

⁵ Balsamon in c. 39 (*P. G.* cxxxvii. 649 B). Theodore Balsamon was patriarch of Antioch, 1193–†1200. He speaks of the church of Cyprus as free and autocephalous, *In c. 3 Conc. CP.* (*Op.* i. 88; *P. G.* cxxxvii. 320 A): see also Bingham, *Ant.* ii. xviii, § 2. ⁶ *Ep.* xxiv, § 4 (*P. L.* xx. 549 sqq.).

⁷ Cyril, *Ep.* lxxv (*Op.* x. 202; *P. G.* lxxvii. 349).

as we learn from *Miramur prudentiam*—a letter addressed by Pope Innocent to Maximian, a Macedonian bishop. Maximian had been a friend of Chrysostom, and had entreated Innocent to recognize Atticus. ‘Not until he has given the same satisfaction in the matter of John as has just been given by Alexander,’ was the answer.¹ So things stood when Alexander died. He was one of those ‘who in a short time fulfilled a long time’; and he did more for the Church in his brief episcopate than many who ruled for half a life-time.² He was succeeded by Theodotus, 421–†9, a man ever strict with himself and gentle towards others.³ He united with his flock the remnant of the Apollinarians⁴; and yielded to the popular demand that he should replace the name of Chrysostom which he had removed again from the diptychs of his native Church. This done, however, Theodotus took fright; and, lest he should incur the displeasure of Atticus, desired Acacius of Beroea to write and explain to him that he had acted under pressure. Acacius would have desired that Theodotus had stood firm; but he complied with the request, and also wrote to Cyril in similar terms to make excuses for his chief.⁵ The priest who carried his letter to Constantinople let out its contents, and a demonstration was feared in favour of Chrysostom. At last Atticus weakened. He went to the Emperor and asked what he was to do. ‘What harm’, replied Theodosius, ‘can there be in writing a dead man’s name on a tablet for the sake of peace?’ So Atticus yielded, and the name of Chrysostom was vindicated at Constantinople as at Antioch. But Atticus thought it prudent to write at once to Cyril, in justification of his conduct. ‘One must sometimes’, he says, ‘put peace before rules, though we ought not to habituate the people to govern, as in a democracy. Still, I do not think I have offended against the canons, for John’s name has been inserted not on a list of deceased bishops only, but of inferior clergy and laity also.’⁶ It was a mean man’s letter. Cyril’s reply was inhuman: ‘I would as soon be induced to replace the name of Judas on the list of the Apostolic College as that of John on the diptychs.’⁷ But Isidore of Pelusium, †440,

¹ Innocent, *Ep.* xxii (*P. L.* xx. 545 A); Jaffé, No. 308.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* x. 656.

³ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxviii, § 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁵ This letter of Acacius is lost, but we know of it from Cyril’s letter to Atticus, *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* x. 207; *P. L.* lxxvii. 357 B).

⁶ Cyril, *Ep.* lxxv (*Op.* x. 203; *P. G.* lxxvii. 352 A).

⁷ *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* x. 206; *P. G.* lxxvii. 356 B).

remonstrated with Cyril, and bade him beware of passion like that of his uncle Theophilus, and of maintaining divisions in the Church under pretence of piety.¹ Cyril at last submitted, and by 429 the three great sees of the East were once more in communion with Rome, which had steadily held aloof from all who did injustice to the memory of Chrysostom.

§ 3. Theophilus died, in a spirit of compunction at his own worldliness,² on 15 October 412, and was succeeded by his nephew, Cyril,³ as archbishop of Alexandria, 412–†44. Cyril was his sister's son, and a native of Alexandria. He was brought up under Serapion in the Nitrian desert. But asceticism did not subdue his ambition; and Isidore of Pelusium warned him that his thoughts were not in the wilderness but in the world.⁴ After five years in Nitria he received a welcome summons from his uncle to return to Alexandria. Here he was ordained; and in teaching and preaching acquired a considerable reputation. He went with his uncle to the Synod of the Oak, 403, for the deposition of Chrysostom⁵; and, though a man of intellectual ability, never would he open the books of Origen. There was a bitter contest for the Throne of the Evangelist between Cyril and his uncle's archdeacon, Timotheus; but, in three days, the party of Cyril prevailed and he was consecrated, 18 October 412.⁶ Cyril began ill for the man to whom the Church is indebted for the defence of the Divine Person of our Lord: for, says Socrates, 'he proved to be more masterful than Theophilus; and from his days the See of Alexandria, not content with its ecclesiastical rank, began to play the tyrant in civil affairs.'⁷ Theophilus was secular-minded; but Cyril a thorough hierarch.⁸

¹ *Epp.* i. ccclxx (*Op.* i. 96 sq.; *P. G.* lxxviii. 392 c); *Fleury*, xxvi. xxx.

² *Socr. H. E.* vii. vii, § 1.

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 267–676; *Fleury*, xxii. xlvi, xxiii. xxv; *Gibbon*, c. xlvii (v. 107 sqq.); *Newman*, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 341 sqq., 354 sqq.; *J. M. Neale*, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, i. 225–77; *W. Bright* in *D. C. B.* i. 763–73; *Bardenhewer*, 360 sqq.

⁴ Isidore, *Epp.* i. xxv (*Op.* 8; *P. G.* lxxviii. 197); and see also *Epp.* i. cccx, ccxxiii, ccxxiv, ccclxx (*Op.* 82, 87, 96; *P. L.* lxxviii. 362, 370, 392). *Neale* calls these 'unjust rebukes' (*Patr. Al.* i. 277); and it must be remembered that Isidore was one of the Antiochene school and a disciple of Chrysostom, *Bardenhewer*, 379 sq.

⁵ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxiii (*Op.* x. 99; *P. G.* lxxvii. 159 c).

⁶ *Socr. H. E.* vii. vii, §§ 2–4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 4. Socrates says the same of the Roman see under Caelestine, and, for the same reason, that Caelestine like Cyril, bore hard upon the Novatianists (*H. E.* vii. xi, § 4); further, that as the power of the bishop went up, the authority of the governor of Alexandria went down (*ibid.* vii. xi, § 9), with which cf. *Tillemont*, *Mém.* xiv. 269.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 5.

(1) Thus one of his first proceedings was that he persecuted the Novatianists by closing their churches and depriving their bishop, Theopemptus, of all his property. He strained *Cassatis quae*,¹ of 30 June 412, a recent piece of legislation directed against the Donatists, in order to be able to punish the Novatianists; and in view of his treatment of them, and his hostility to the name of Chrysostom, we must probably allow some antipathy to Cyril on the part of Socrates.

(2) He next attacked the Jews.² The position of the Jews in the Roman Empire was one of considerable influence. Since the days of Julian and the audacious hopes of that time,³ they had been exempted from interference by Christian rulers. Valentinian and Valens respected their rites.⁴ Theodosius allowed their spiritual jurisdiction, and ordered a bishop to restore at his own expense the synagogue at Callinicum which his flock had destroyed. Arcadius required that goods sold by Jews should be sold at prices to be fixed by Jews and not by Christians⁵; and forbade any insult to be offered to their 'illustrious patriarchs',⁶ whom Chrysostom describes as 'hucksterers and traders full of all iniquity'.⁷ The name 'patriarch' did not come to be applied to the occupants of the great sees of Christendom till the Council of Chalcedon,⁸ nor had it as yet been adopted by the Christian Church. It belonged to the Jewish pontiff at Tiberias and his apostles,⁹ who exacted tribute for his support even so far afield as in Spain and Africa. The patriarchate, however, was destroyed by a law of 399,¹² and the last patriarch deposed by another of 415.¹¹ But Honorius forbade insults to Jewish synagogues and all interference with the sabbath in 412.¹² So Judaism occupied a privileged position in the Empire. In some places it was even socially important: as in Antioch, where Chrysostom tells us that it was 'the thing' for Christians to go to the synagogue.¹³ And the language of the leaders of the Church—his own, for instance, and that of Ambrose over the affair of Callinicum—indicates the alarm that was felt

¹ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 52.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 270 sqq.; Fleury, xxiii. xxv.

³ H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews* ⁵, iii. 17 sqq.

⁴ So says Arcadius in *Iudaei sint obstricti* of 1 July 397, *Cod. Theod.* xvi. viii. 13.

⁵ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. viii. 10.

⁶ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. viii. 11, 12.

⁷ *Adv. Iudaeos*, vi, § 5 (*Op.* i. 656 E; *P. G.* xlviii. 911).

⁸ W. Bright, *Canons* ², 104.

⁹ H. H. Milman, *Hist. Jews* ⁵, ii. 461.

¹⁰ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. viii. 14.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 22.

¹² *Ibid.* 20.

¹³ *Adv. Iud.* iv, § 7 (*Op.* i. 626 A; *P. G.* xlviii. 881).

at the power of Judaism. Nowhere would it be more resented than in Alexandria, where the Jews occupied a separate and wealthy quarter of the city,¹ where their 'ethnarch', as Origen calls him, had great authority,² and where Jews had lent steady support to Arianism.³ Signs of this resentment survive in the law of Theodosius II, of 29 May 408, by which he forbids the gibbeting of Haman on the Feast of Purim, because it was taken by Christians as a burlesque of the Crucifixion,⁴ and in the story of the murdered Christian boy which is given by Socrates⁵ as the occasion of the enactment, and is the precursor of the many stories of ritual-murder by Jews, such as that of St. William of Norwich,⁶ who was said to have been done to death by Jews on 25 March 1144, or the little St. Hugh of Lincoln⁷ on 27 August 1255. We must make some allowance, therefore, for the bitter feelings of Christian against Jew in Alexandria, and take into account the perpetual feuds between the two religions there, if we are to be fair to Cyril for expelling the Jews from Alexandria.⁸ The pretext for the new feud arose out of the behaviour of some of the laxer Jews who went to see a troop of dancers at the theatre on the sabbath. Factions were formed, as usual, for and against the performers, and Jews were found on one side and Christians on the other. Orestes, the Augustal Prefect, who had only just conformed to the Church, was transacting public business one day in the theatre, when several of Cyril's supporters, among them a schoolmaster, named Hierax, who arranged the applause at the archbishop's sermons,⁹ were present to hear the Governor's ordinances. The Jews noticed him in the crowd, and noisily exclaimed that Hierax had come to excite a tumult. Thereupon Orestes, who looked upon bishops, and upon Cyril in particular, as dangerous rivals to the civil power, seized Hierax and had him scourged on the spot. The archbishop retorted by sending for the chief Jewish residents and threatening them. His threats only served to increase the bitterness; and a plan was formed among

¹ Milman, *Hist. Jews* ⁵, ii. 24.

² *Ep. ad Africanum*, § 14 (*Op.* i. 28; *P. G.* xi. 84 A).

³ Milman, *Hist. Jews* ⁵, iii. 15, 27; H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism*, c. iii.

⁴ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. viii. 18.

⁵ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xvi.

⁶ R. Stanton, *Menology*, 132.

⁷ *Ibid.* 415.

⁸ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xiii; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 270 sq.; Fleury, xxiii. xxv.

⁹ For applause at sermons, see Bingham, *Ant.* xiv. iv, §§ 27, 28; Fleury, ii. 265, note i.

the Jews to attack the Christians by night. The attack was carried out, and several Christians perished. Then Cyril, instead of applying to the magistrates, took the law into his own hands ; and, at the head of a mob, took forcible possession of the synagogues, drove the Jews out of Alexandria, and handed over their houses to pillage. Governor and archbishop both set their case before the Emperor, when the people, alarmed at the loss to the trade of Alexandria by the expulsion of the Jews, put pressure on Cyril to make advances to Orestes for a reconciliation. But, at this point, another element of disorder made its appearance.¹ News was carried to Nitria of the breach between Cyril and Orestes, when the monks rushed into the city, five hundred strong, and stoned the Prefect. One of them, Ammonius by name, hit him on the head with a stone and drew blood. But the mob rescued the Governor and, driving off the monks, laid hold on Ammonius, who was tortured to death. Cyril so far forgot himself as to give him the honours of a public funeral and to panegyryze him in church. He was for dubbing him 'Martyr' ; but the saner sort among his people saved him from this folly. The whole affair, however, was a high-handed proceeding. A worse tragedy followed.

(3) Hypatia,² daughter of Theon the philosopher, was the boast of Alexandrian paganism. She was learned, eloquent, dignified in bearing, irreproachable in character—the glory of the Neoplatonic school. Pupils flocked to her lectures from all parts : among them Synesius, afterwards bishop of Ptolemais, 409–†13, and her friend and correspondent. Magistrates also paid her deference, and she was on terms of intimacy with the Prefect Orestes. This gave the mob to believe that she it was who influenced him against Cyril ; and headed by one Peter, a Reader, with his fanatical following of Parabolani,³ they watched her movements, dragged her from her carriage, stripped her, and tore her limb from limb in the church of the Caesareum, and burnt her remains in public. Gibbon calls it 'one of St. Cyril's exploits' ⁴; but there is no proof that Cyril was directly responsible for the deed, and Socrates, no friend to Cyril, is content to say that 'it brought no small blame on Cyril and the church of the Alexandrians'.⁵ The deed was

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xiv.

² Ibid. vii. xv ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 274 sq. ; Fleury, xxiii. xxv.

³ For Parabolani see Bingham, *Ant.* iii. ix, § 4 ; Fleury, ii. 268, note k.

⁴ Gibbon, xlvii, n. 27 (v. 110). ⁵ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xv, § 6.

done by Peter and his Parabolani only ; but Cyril had used them before, and, in his attack upon the Jews, he had let loose savage passions which afterwards he could not rein in. He is not quite clear, therefore, of the guilt of bloodshed ; and what was done by his agents was ‘ an audacious crime ’ which ‘ deservedly threw a dark cloud over the reputation of Cyril ’.¹ It was in Lent, 415, that the murder took place ; and it was the occasion of *Quia inter cetera* of 29 September 416 by which Theodosius II required that the clergy should take no part in public affairs, reduced the numbers of the Parabolani, and deprived the archbishop of their nomination.² By *Parabolani* of 3 February 418, however, these restrictions were removed, though their numbers were still limited, by this edict, to six hundred.³

II

The support rendered to Cyril against Orestes by the monks of Nitria is a reminder that the occupants of the great sees were confronted by a rival force, with which the episcopate would shortly have to measure its strength. This force was Monasticism.

§ 4. It is recalled to our notice at this epoch by the death of Jerome, 30 September 420. The priest Innocent, who had been sent by the Council of Carthage in 419 to Cyril of Alexandria for copies of the Nicene Canons, returned by way of Palestine, and paid Jerome a visit at Bethlehem. Jerome took the opportunity of sending to Alypius and Augustine the letter which proved to be his last.⁴ A certain Anianus of Celeda [? Ceneda in Venetia], it appears, who had acted as secretary to Pelagius at ‘ that wretched synod of Diospolis ’,⁵ December 415, had put out an answer to Jerome’s anti-Pelagian treatises of 415—the letter to Ctesiphon and the Dialogue. It would not have been difficult to reply to ‘ his silly tattle ’, and Jerome would have liked to ‘ dress him down a bit ’, so he tells his African friends. But it is too late. His growing infirmities and the recent death of Eustochium, 28 September 419, have taken the heart out of him. Alypius and Augustine would do it far better. Then follow greetings. They show that Jerome was not left in solitude by the death of the daughter of Paula. Her niece, the younger Paula, was with him. So, too, were the worthy Pinian, his wife, Melania the younger, and

¹ J. M. Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 228.

² *Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 42.


³ *Ibid.* 43.

⁴ Jerome, *Ep.* cxliii (*Op.* i. 1066–8; *P. L.* xxii. 1181 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 2.

her mother, Albina. From Hippo they had arrived in Palestine, 414; and, as we have seen, had vainly endeavoured to assure themselves, in correspondence with Augustine, that Pelagius was coming back to the Catholic Faith. So the old quarrel between Bethlehem and Olivet, between the adherents of Jerome and the followers of Rufinus, was a memory of the past; and the granddaughter of Paula, the elder¹ was keeping watch with the grandchildren of the elder Melania² round the death-bed of Jerome. He breathed his last on 30 September 420: a saint, less for what he was than for what, by his scholarship and his translations of the Scriptures, he did as Doctor of the Church.

§ 5. The Messalians, as we have seen, were less of monks than quietists; but they continued to give trouble to the hierarchy, much as did Priscillianists and Manichaeans to the Western episcopate. They multiplied in Asia Minor; and, before the death of Atticus, †425, had quite alarmed him and his colleagues. He wrote to the bishops of Pamphylia to suppress them.³ On the death of Atticus, a Council met at Constantinople, under the presidency of Theodotus of Antioch, to consecrate Sisinnius to the vacant throne. This done, the Synod wrote to the metropolitans of Pamphylia I and II, Amphilochius of Side, 426-†58, and Beronician of Perga, 426-†31, respectively, threatening deposition, without any *locus penitentiae*, to any cleric convicted of association with the Messalians.⁴ John of Antioch, 428-†41, warned Nestorius



² For Albina, Melania II, and Pinian, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 232 sqq.,
Melania I, 350-†410

Publicola, † 405 = Albina, † 431-2

Publicola

Melania II = Pinian, Vicarius Urbis
383-†439 385 and † 431-2

³ Photius, *Cod.* lii (*Op.* iii. 13 a; *P. G.* ciii. 89 A).

⁴ Ibid. (*Op.* iii. 13 a; *P. G.* ciii. 89 B).

his friend and colleague at Constantinople, against them. Archaëus, exarch of Caesarea in Cappadocia, †431, condemned twenty-four propositions of theirs; and his suffragan, Heraclidas of Nyssa, c. 431, put out two letters against their tenets. Finally, the Council of Ephesus condemned them,¹ 431. But they survived it. One of them, Lampetius, got himself ordained priest by Alypius, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, c. 458. He appears to have combined an unsavoury reputation, with a large following: even so far afield as Egypt, where his followers were known as Lampetians.² Later on, there developed another sect of Messalians by the name of Marcianites.³ There were Messalians, and collisions between them and the hierarchy, in Armenia. In the seventh century they seem to have been absorbed into the Paulicians.

Monasticism proper, during the first quarter of the fifth century, was represented in each of the three chief divisions of the Eastern Empire.

§ 6. In Egypt, there lived Isidore of Pelusium, †440, and Nilus, †430, both indefatigable letter-writers.

Nilus⁴ had been Prefect of Constantinople, and very wealthy. Leaving his younger son in the care of his wife, he parted from her, and retired, with his elder son, Theodulus, to the deserts of Sinai.⁵ There the monks lived at short distances from each other⁶; but they had a priest among them, and assembled every Lord's Day for the Eucharist.⁷ Its consecration, we may note in passing, Nilus ascribes to 'the dread-inspiring invocations, and the descent of the adorable and life-giving Spirit': for then 'that which is on the Holy Table is no longer simple bread and common wine, but the precious Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our God'.⁸ Soon after Alaric's capture of Rome, the peace of the community was suddenly destroyed, 14 January 411, by Saracen raids.⁹ In one of these Theodulus was carried off; and, only after hair-breadth

¹ Photius, *Cod.* lii (*Op.* iii. 13 a; *P. G.* ciii. 89 c).

² Ibid. (*Op.* iii. 13 b; *P. G.* ciii. 89 sq.).

³ Timothy of C. P. [early seventh cent.], *De receptione haereticorum* (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 45-52).

⁴ For his life, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 189-218; Fleury, *xxi.* xlviii, *xxii.* xxii; and for his works, *P. G.* lxxix; Bardenheuer, 381.

⁵ *Narratio i* (*Op.* 15; *P. G.* lxxix. 601 c).

⁶ *N.* iii (*Op.* 37; *P. G.* lxxix. 620 c).

⁷ *N.* iii (*Op.* 38; *P. G.* lxxix. 621 a).

⁸ *Epp.* i. xlv (*Op.* 21; *P. G.* lxxix. 104), and Document No. 191.

⁹ *N.* iv (*Op.* 46 sq.; *P. G.* lxxix. 628 sqq.).

escapes, restored to his father.¹ Nilus resumed his literary occupations. In letters, of which there are ascribed to him and remain one thousand and sixty-one, though few of these in their original form, he reproved even Arcadius, for the persecution of John²; for Nilus was an ardent supporter of his archbishop.³ In treatises he dealt sometimes with the principal virtues of the Christian life and their contrary vices,⁴ but also with the life of the monks.⁵ He criticizes, in particular, their growing secularity.⁶ Thus, by the testimony of its best representatives, Eastern monasticism was already crying out for that subjection of the monastic institute to the bishops⁷ with which it was visited, for its excesses, by the Council of Chalcedon.

A second letter-writer and partisan of Chrysostom was Isidore of Pelusium.⁸ He stood for the exegetical principles of the Antiochene school, though he does not scorn the use of allegory for edification; and his correspondence, consisting of some two thousand letters, in five books, is mainly taken up with questions of interpretation. Photius praises them as models of epistolary style.⁹ But personal matters, even personalities, occupy a good deal of Isidore's attention. Few escaped his invective; and probably the recipients of his favours were not so charmed with his style as was Photius, who read them in a library. Monks, priests, bishops, civil functionaries, great men at Court, come in for their share of rebuke in turn. Not only Theophilus¹⁰ and his nephew Cyril,¹¹ for their antipathy to Chrysostom, and the violence with which they displayed it; but even the pious and gentle Theodosius II.¹² It speaks well for the men in high place at that day, whether archbishops or emperors, that the abbot of Pelusium was suffered to reprove unanswered and to die in peace.

¹ N. v, vii (*Op.* 61, 110, 117; *P. G.* 642, 682, 688).

² *Epp.* II. cclxv, III. cclxxix (*Op.* 254, 435; *P. G.* lxxix. 336, 522).

³ *Epp.* II. ccxciii, ccxciv (*Op.* 265 sq.; *P. G.* lxxix. 345 sqq.).

⁴ e. g. *De octo spiritibus malitiae* (*Op.* 456-74; *P. G.* lxxix. 1145-64).

⁵ e. g. *De monastica exercitatione* (*Op.* 1-83; *P. G.* 719-810).

⁶ *Ibid.*, cc. vi-ix.

⁷ *Chalc.*, cc. 3, 4, 7; W. Bright, *Canons*², xxxix-xli, 157 sqq.

⁸ For his life, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 97 sqq.; Fleury, *xxi.* xviii, *xxiii.* xxvii, *xxvi.* v; Bardenhewer, 379; and for his works, *P. G.* lxxviii.

⁹ Photius, *Epp.* II. xlv (*Op.* ii; *P. G.* cii. 861 D).

¹⁰ Isidore, *Epp.* I. clii (*Op.* 47; *P. G.* lxxviii. 284 sq.).

¹¹ e. g. *Epp.* I. cccx (*Op.* 82; *P. G.* lxxviii. 361 c), which begins: 'Sympathy [such as Theodoret's with Nestorius] may not see clearly, but antipathy [such as Cyril's against Nestorius] does not see at all'; and see Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 356 sq.

¹² *Epp.* I. xxxv, cccxi (*Op.* 11, 83; *P. G.* lxxviii. 204, 361 sq.).

§ 7. To Syria belong Alexander, †430, and Simeon, †459, celebrated each as the originator of a new variety of self-discipline.

Alexander¹ was born in Asia Minor, and held office in the Imperial household. But he withdrew to the deserts of Syria, where he won a great reputation from Antioch to Edessa. His disciples ran into hundreds; and were pledged to rigid poverty, to abstention from work, and to perpetual prayer. Some were gathered into monasteries. Others traversed the deserts, as missionaries, right up to the Persian frontier. At Edessa, Alexander converted a magistrate, Rabbûla,² afterwards bishop of Edessa, 412–†35, who eventually became the champion of Cyrilline orthodoxy in Mesopotamia, and is credited with the authorship of the Peshitta version of the New Testament. Alexander had previously visited Antioch, c. 404, to oppose the intrusion of Porphyrius, 404–†13; and, on a second visit, 421, he had trouble with the mild Theodotus, 421–†9, who took him for Messalian and procured his banishment.³ Alexander then quitted Syria, and went to Constantinople with twenty-four monks, where he founded a monastery near the Church of St. Menas. The community presently grew to as many as three hundred, for monks were attracted from other convents. Divided into six companies, they kept up a sleepless round of perpetual prayer⁴; and hence their name—the Acoemetæ.⁵ But to other ascetics this was perpetual idleness; and St. Nilus, from distant Sinai, denounced it as an invention of ‘Adelphius of Mesopotamia’ and of ‘Alexander who has given some trouble at Constantinople’.⁶ Alexander thus found himself in bad company, for Adelphius was one of the founders of the Messalians. But he was allowed to die in peace; and his monastery, transferred from Gomon⁷ on the Asiatic side, at the mouth of the Euxine,⁸ to Irenæum,⁹ nearer Constantinople, became a model for other communities, under his successor, Marcellus,¹⁰ 440–†86. Thus the observance of the Messalians found

¹ For his *Vita* see *Acta Sanctorum Ianuarii* [15th], i. 1018–29; Fleury, xxv. xxvii; and for the monastery of the Acoemetæ at Constantinople, *Revue des questions historiques*, lxxv (January 1899), 133 sqq.

² *Vita*, §§ 9–15.

³ *Ibid.*, § 41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 43.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 53.

⁶ Nilus, *De voluntaria paupertate*, xxi (*Op.* 260; *P. G.* lxxix. 997 A).

⁷ *Vita*, § 52.

⁸ *Vita Marcelli*, § 4, ap. Symeon Metaphrastes, iii (*P. G.* cxvi. 709 c).

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 6 (*P. G.* cxvi. 712 D).

¹⁰ For his life see Symeon Metaphrastes, *Vita Sanctorum* (*P. G.* cxvi. 705–46); Fleury, xxvii. xxx.

a home in the Church ; and perpetual psalmody became the rule not only for several religious houses of Constantinople, but of the abbey of St. Maurice in the valley of the Rhone.

A different fashion in austerities was set by St. Simeon Stylites,¹ 388–†459 ; whose manner of life is described for us by his contemporary Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus 423–†58, a small town of Syria some two days' journey from Antioch. Simeon was, at first, a shepherd² ; and, about 404, became a monk in a monastery.³ But his taste for austerities rendered him unfit for the life of a community, and he withdrew to live alone.⁴ He passed Lent without eating or drinking at all.⁵ He chained himself to a rock, 413–23. Then, giving up his chain,⁶ he took up his abode in an enclosed cell and, finally, 423, on a column—though, at first, this was to escape the importunity of his admirers.⁷ From time to time he raised the height of his pillar, until, at last, when Theodoret saw it, *c.* 430, the pillar was about sixty feet high.⁸ So Simeon received his visitors. Other solitaries denounced his eccentricities⁹ ; but he was a man of such simplicity and goodness¹⁰ that men would excuse anything from him, and paid him the tribute of a popularity without limit. Theodosius II consulted him,¹¹ 432 ; and, when the saint fell ill, sent his own physician to attend him.¹² Workmen at Rome put up his image over the door to protect their workshops.¹³ St. Geneviève of Paris, 422–†512, exchanged compliments with him¹⁴ ; and his fame was carried, on the caravan routes, into far Turkestan. But it was in the immediate neighbourhood of his column that he exerted the greatest influence. The tribesmen of the desert took him for a superhuman being,¹⁵ and crowded to listen to the sermons which Simeon addressed to them from that unusual pulpit. One day Theodoret stood in the crowd, when the saint observed him and directed the people to

¹ For whom, see Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* c. xxvi (*Op.* iii. 1265–83 ; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1464–84) ; *Acta SS. Ian.* i. 261–86 ; S. E. Assemani, *Acta Mart. Orient.* i. 268–398 (Romae, 1748) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 347–91 ; C. Kingsley, *Hermits*, 197 sqq. (1890).

² Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* xxvi (*Op.* iii. 1266 ; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1465 B).

³ Ibid. (1468 A).

⁴ Ibid. (1468 D).

⁵ Ibid. (1469 sqq.).

⁶ Ibid. (1472).

⁷ Ibid. (1472 sq.).

⁸ Ibid. (1473).

⁹ So says Theodorus Lector [*c.* 500–†50], *Eccl. Hist.* ii, § 41 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 205 A).

¹⁰ Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* xxvi (*Op.* iii. 1280 ; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1481 D).

¹¹ Labbe, *Concilia*, iii. 1086 (Paris, 1671) ; Fleury, xxvi. xvii.

¹² S. E. Assemani, *Act. Mart. Orient.* i. 306.

¹³ Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* xxvi (*ut sup.*).

¹⁴ *Vita S. Genovefae Virg.*, § 22 (*Acta SS. Ian.* i. 145) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 797.

¹⁵ Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* xxvi (*Op.* iii. 1280 ; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1481 B).

seek his blessing, as he was a bishop. They nearly stifled him as they rushed to obtain it; but Simeon, from his pillar, called them off.¹ Nor was it the common folk only who thus hung upon his lips. In 458 his advice was taken about maintaining the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.² The same question was put to provincial synods of the East.³ So the authority of the Stylite took rank with that of a synod. Next year he died, 2 September 459. For months past the news of his illness had brought pilgrims in crowds to hear his last words; and, on his death, his body was carried in great pomp to Antioch, where it was laid to rest in the principal church.⁴ The column also was preserved, and surrounded by a spacious octagonal courtyard, with four large basilicas abutting upon it.⁵ The remains of these, and even of the identical column, may still be seen at Kalat-Sem'an, or the Castle of Simeon, between Antioch and Aleppo,⁶ to testify to the veneration in which the first of the Stylites was held.

§ 8. At Constantinople monachism begins with the epoch of Theodosius I⁷; and Syria, Egypt, and Armenia contributed to its acclimatization there.⁸ The first foundation took root near the hermitage of a Syrian, named Isaac,⁹ and owed its origin to an officer of the Imperial Guard, who afterwards succeeded Isaac as the abbot Dalmatius, †c. 440.¹⁰ Isaac had prophesied the death of Valens; had taken an active part against Chrysostom¹¹; and was no less active in fostering religious houses. On the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus lay the Villa of the Oak, where the Council of that name was held, 403, to put Chrysostom on his trial. It belonged to the minister Rufinus. He founded there a colony of monks

¹ Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* (1476 c).

² Evagrius, *H. E.* ii, § 10 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2532 sq.).

³ Ibid. ii, § 9 (2528). ⁴ Ibid. i, § 13 (2457). ⁵ Ibid. i, § 14 (2460 sqq.).

⁶ Once called Telamissus (Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* xxvi [*Op.* iii. 1269; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1470 A]), a name still preserved in Tell Neschin (the Women's Mountain), now Deir Sem'an (the Convent of Simeon). For a modern description, see M. de Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale*, 141-54, with plates 139-50; for the guest-houses, *ibid.* 128 sqq. (pl. 114). One has an inscription of its date, 22 July 479; another, 15 October 479; cf. Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions, &c.*, partie vi, Syrie, section x, Antiochène, nn. 2691, 2692 (tom. iii: Paris, 1870).

⁷ See 'Les débuts du monachisme à CP., par J. Pargoire', *ap. Revue des questions hist.* lxxv (January 1899), 67-143, esp. p. 117.

⁸ Ibid. 119.

⁹ Ibid. 121.

¹⁰ *Revue*, lxxv. 120 sqq.; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 321 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xliii, xxvi. vi, vii. It was Dalmatius who, in a conversation with Theodosius II (Mansi, iv. 1429), broke the spell, 431, by which the Nestorians had bound the Emperor to their side, Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 418.

¹¹ Palladius, *Vita*, §§ 6, 8 (*Op.* xiii. 20 B, 29 E; *P. L.* xlvi. 21, 29); Fleury, xxi. xvii.

from Egypt, and both Rufinus himself and Ammonius, one of the Tall Brothers, came to be buried in its church. But the Egyptians returned on the fall of their founder ; and their place was taken, c. 403, by the community of a Phrygian named Hypatius,¹ who ruled it as abbot for forty years, 406–†46. He came originally from Halmyrissus,² a convent in Thrace which owed its foundation to a soldier named Jonas, who was from Armenia, and so fellow-countryman of Eustathius of Sebaste, 351–†78. Hypatius was of a lively temper. He fell out with Eulalius, the bishop of Chalcedon, 430–†51 ; once over Alexander the Acoemete, whom he rescued from a beating by the bishop's servants³ ; once again over Nestorius, whose name he insisted on removing from the diptychs, before he had been summoned to appear at the Council of Ephesus, and in spite of the orders of Eulalius⁴ ; and, finally, over the attempt of Leontius, Prefect of Constantinople, to revive the Olympic Games at Chalcedon. The bishop supported the Prefect ; but Hypatius regarded the proposal as a return to paganism, and baffled both its supporters.⁵ Not less troublesome to authority were the monks of the capital itself. The archbishop of New Rome was, of course, a potentate compared to the bishop of an ordinary see, like Eulalius. But they made him feel their power. They ranged themselves with effect against Chrysostom, 398–404 ; and, if they kept the peace with Atticus, 406–†25, it was because he had taken their side at the Council of the Oak. Nestorius, 428–31, Flavian, 446–†9, and Anatolius, 449–†58, were each to experience their hostility. At last, the Council of Chalcedon, 451, had to bring them to heel.⁶

¹ *Vita in Acta SS.* [17th] *Iunii*, iii. 308–49.

² *Ibid.*, § 6.

³ *Ibid.*, § 57. ⁴ *Ibid.*, § 44. ⁵ *Ibid.*, § 45.

⁶ *Chalc.*, cc. 3, 4, 7.

CHAPTER XI

NESTORIUS AND CYRIL, 428-31

It is now time to turn to the first of those great questions which had been better handled without the interference of the monks, viz. Nestorianism.¹ Its story within the Empire covers 428-35.

§ 1. Nestorius,² as we have seen, was a priest of some reputation as preacher and abbot at Antioch when, to get rid of the rivalries for the throne vacated by Sisinnius, Theodosius II appointed him archbishop of Constantinople. Leaving Antioch early in 428, with Anastasius in attendance as his chaplain, Nestorius visited Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, 392-†428, on the way, not long before that great scholar's death.³ He had been brought up under Theodore's influences; and so too had his friend John who, about this time, on the death of Theodotus, succeeded him as bishop of Antioch, 428-†441. On the departure of Nestorius, after a two days' visit, Theodore warned him not to be so hot against the opinions of others 'I admire your zeal; but I should be sorry', said he, 'if it brought you to a bad end.'⁴ Nestorius continued his journey, and was consecrated at Constantinople, 10 April 428. Preaching himself on the occasion, he forgot his master's advice and cried, 'Give me, O Emperor, the earth purged from heretics: and I will repay you with heaven. Help me to harry the heretics; and I will aid you to harry the Persians.'⁵ Nor, so far as heretics were concerned, was this idle rhetoric. The Arians had succeeded, despite the law, in retaining a chapel within the walls of Constantine. Nestorius discovered it. Five days after his consecration the police turned them out⁶; and, by *Haereticorum ita est*,⁷ of 30 May 428, the Emperor supported the campaign against them. Nestorius immediately took advantage

¹ F. Loofs, *Nestoriana*; Nestorius, *Le livre d'Héraclide*, traduit en français par F. Nau (Paris, 1910); J. Tixeront, *Hist. dogm.* iii. 10-75; J. B.-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching* (1908); 'Nestorius the Nestorian' in *C. Q. R.* lxxiii. 296 sqq. (Jan. 1912), a criticism of B.-Baker.

² *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxix, xxxi; Fleury, xxiv. lv.

³ *Thdt. H. E.* v. xl. With this event Theodoret concludes his history.

⁴ P. Bedjan, *Le livre d'H.*, p. iii; F. Nau, *Le livre d'H.*, p. vi, n. 1.

⁵ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxix, § 5. Perhaps S. embellishes a bit.

⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 8-10.

⁷ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 65.

of the enactment to deal with other dissidents. The Quarto-decimans, still numerous in Lydia and Caria, were provoked into resistance; and riots in Sardis and Miletus were quelled in blood.¹ The Macedonians of the province of the Hellespont were made to feel the heavy hand of Nestorius through Antony, bishop of Germa, who hunted them down for him. They murdered Antony; and this was the end of their sect, for an imperial order closed their churches.² The archbishop also set upon the Novatianists; but they were too much in favour at Court.³ 'In all this', says Socrates, no friend, perhaps, to Nestorius because of his attempt upon the Novatianists, 'Nestorius was acting contrary to the practice of the Church.'⁴ Certainly, the Church had tolerated them. They were no heretics; but this scourge of heretics came quickly to be regarded as a heretic himself.

We have now to trace the beginnings of his heresy. It was the natural outcome of the teaching traditional at Antioch, but specially as developed by Diodore.

§ 2. Diodore⁵ was for some time Head of the Catechetical School at Antioch, and subsequently bishop of Tarsus, 378-†94.

He came of a noble family in Antioch,⁶ and was distinguished alike for character and ability. Sharing with one, Carterius, the government of a Religious House in or near the city,⁷ he devoted himself to the defence both of the Christian Faith against heathenism, and of orthodoxy against heresy. In the character of apologist he earned a certificate of merit from Julian who wrote of him that he had equipped his malevolent tongue against the gods of old with the wisdom of Athens herself; and, in return, his gaunt figure and pale face, together with his wretched health, were so many tokens of the wrath of heaven.⁸ But before Julian became acquainted with him, presumably when spending the winter of 362-3 in Antioch, Diodore had distinguished himself as the champion of Catholicism, as well as of Christianity, in company with his friend Flavian, afterwards bishop of Antioch, 381-†404. Both were ardent Nicenes; and, as laymen, had resisted the

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxix, § 12.

² Ibid. xxxi.

³ Ibid. xxix, § 11.

⁴ Ibid. xxxi, § 1; for the protection of Novatianists by Theodosius I see *ibid.* v. xx, § 6.

⁵ For Diodore, see *Dissertatio*, i, § 8, in Marius Mercator (*P. L.* xlviii. 1145 sqq.); J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 11 sqq.; Bardenhewer, 315 sqq.

⁶ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxv, § 4.

⁷ Socr. *H. E.* vi. iii, § 6; Soz. *H. E.* viii. ii, § 6.

⁸ Julian, *Ep.* lxxix (*Op.* ii. 605 sq. : Teubner, 1875).

Arianizing Leontius, bishop of Antioch 344-†57. They compelled him to get rid of his deacon, Aetius, the founder of the Anomoeans; and they put heart into Catholics by the introduction into worship of antiphonal singing. As priests, they once more rallied the faithful¹ who, on the third exile of Meletius, 372, in the persecution of Valens, refused to communicate with the Arian intruder, Euzoïus, 361-†78. But Diodore had to fly from Antioch. He took refuge, for a while, in Armenia, as did Meletius; and, while there, came into contact with Basil.² After the overthrow of Arianism by the defeat and death of Valens, its last patron, at the battle of Adrianople, 378, Meletius recovered his see and made Diodore bishop of Tarsus. In this capacity Diodore took part in the Second Oecumenical Council; while in *Episcopis tradi*³ of 30 July 381—the decree confirmatory of its decisions—he is named as one of the two bishops in ‘the East’, communion with whom is to be reckoned as a note of orthodoxy. Diodore was thus, in his lifetime, never without consideration; but after his death, from the opening of the fifth century onwards, his reputation declined.

Catholic in intention, he was the opponent alike of Arian and Apollinarian; and it was in opposition to Apollinaris, his rival at Laodicea in Syria, where he was bishop 361-77, and no less Catholic in intention than Diodore, that Diodore gave to the doctrine of Christ’s Person at Antioch that direction in which it was to move from his day forward. Jealous for the completeness of the human nature in Christ which Apollinaris denied, Diodore distinguished⁴ in the Saviour the Son of God from the son of David. The latter, according to him, was taken and is inhabited by the Former; or, as he puts it, ‘Complete before the ages the Son of God assumed complete the son of David’.⁵ As, then, the son of David is simply the temple of the Word, one cannot speak of him as the Word in the strict sense of the term.⁶ The Word is not son of David; He is David’s lord.⁷ Nor is He son of Mary. Never let God the Word be thought of as Mary’s son.

¹ Thdt. *H. E.* iv. xxv, § 3, v. iv, § 2; Chrysostom, *In laudem Diodori*, § 4 (*Op.* iii. 749; *P. G.* lii. 764).

² Basil, *Ep.* cxxxv (*Op.* iv. 226 sq.; *P. G.* xxxii. 572 sq.)

³ *Cod. Theod.* xvi. i. 3.

⁴ For these passages from Diodore see *Dissertatio* i, § 8 in Marius Mercator (*P. L.* xlviii. 1146-8).

⁵ Diodore, *Contra Synusiastas*, i, Fr. 1 (*P. G.* xxxiii. 1560 A).

⁶ *Ibid.*, Fr. ii (1560 B)

⁷ *Ibid.*, Fr. iii (1560 C).

He has not two births: the first, eternal of the Father, the second, in time, of his mother; but, born of the Father, He made for Himself a temple of him who was born of Mary.¹ The man thus born of Mary is not son of God by nature, but by grace; only God the Word is Son by nature.² But, said Diodore's opponents, there are, on that showing, two Sons.³ Diodore replied with a quibble,⁴ and added that all he meant was that God the eternal Word dwelt in him who was of the seed of David.⁵ Verbally, he maintained the unity of Person in our Lord. He held that just as, at an audience with the Emperor, we 'adore' the imperial mantle because of him who wears it, or the temple because of the god who dwells therein, so the man Jesus simply shares in the adoration due to God the Word.⁶ But this was merely lip-service to the worship of Jesus customary with Christians; and Diodore, in his anxiety to insist on the completeness of our Lord's human nature which Apollinaris had denied, cannot be acquitted of language which separates the two natures in Christ and treats them, each in isolation from the other, as if they were two persons. The Council of Alexandria, 362, had accurately diagnosed the tendency of his teaching when it characterized his school as holding that 'in Christ, the Word, as in a prophet, was simply associated with an holy man'.⁷ Equally discerning, though not quite so fair, was the diagnosis of Julian and of Apollinarian opponents. Julian congratulated Diodore, and the Apollinarians rallied him on reviving the teaching of Photinus, and holding that 'the Divine Word' merely 'dwelt in the seed of David, as in the prophets'. True, with Photinus the Word was impersonal; whereas Diodore spoke of 'the Son of God' in relation to 'the son of David'. But, in disowning the charge, Diodore could only distinguish his view from that of Photinus by saying that, whereas with the Prophets the divine indwelling was temporary and partial, in Jesus it was eternal and entire.⁸ It was simply a difference of degree; and our Lord, on this showing,

¹ Diodore, *Contra Synus.* i, Fr. iii (1560 sq.). ² Ibid., Fr. iii (1560 c).

³ Probably the Apollinarians, but also the Catholics, e. g. Greg. Naz. *Carmen*, xi, ll. 633 sq. (*Op.* ii. 707; *P. G.* xxxvii. 1073 A).

⁴ Fr. i (1560 A).

⁵ Fr. iii (1560 sq.).

⁶ 'Adoramus purpuram propter indutum et templum propter habitatorem, formam servi propter formam Dei,' Marius M., *Excerpta Theodori*, v, § 10 (*P. L.* xlviii. 1062 B). The sentence is probably Diodore's, as it follows language certainly his, §§ 7, 8, 9 (see *ibid.*, 1146 c).

⁷ Ath. *Tomus ad Ant.*, § 7 (*Op.* ii. 618; *P. G.* xxvi. 804 B).

⁸ Marius M., *Excerpta Th.* v, § 9 (*P. L.* xlviii. 1062 B).

was no more than the supreme saint. Diodore, in effect, substituted for the Incarnation a very exceptional degree of intercourse between two persons ; between the Divine Son and one particular man. Cyril of Alexandria was therefore quite right when he observed that, if it be a question of the sources of Nestorianism, they will be found in the teaching of Diodore.¹

§ 3. But there was an intermediary between Diodore and Nestorius. He was the greatest of Antiochene teachers, Theodore,² bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, 392-†428.

(1) In early life³ Theodore, who was born at Antioch, *c.* 350, studied under Libanius, and had Chrysostom for his slightly older friend and fellow-pupil. He was ambitious for the Bar ; but, before the age of twenty and by the advice and example of Chrysostom, he was induced to enter the monastery of Diodore and Carterius.⁴ Then he fell in love with a girl named Hermione, and wished to marry. But Chrysostom dissuaded him, and he returned to the monastery. In 383 he was ordained priest by Flavian, bishop of Antioch ; and there lived, as a student, in the stirring times when Antioch insulted the Imperial Statues, and Flavian went to intercede for his people, while Chrysostom mounted the pulpit to allay their fears. After ten years as presbyter Theodore was appointed bishop of Mopsuestia. Here he took an active part in the defence of Chrysostom, the friend of his youth⁵ ; befriended Julian, bishop of Eclanum, and other Pelagianizing exiles from the West ; and after receiving Nestorius on his way to possess himself of the throne of Constantinople, died at the end of an episcopate of six and thirty years.

(2) As a writer⁶ his labours extended over sixty years ; and, as they were mainly in exposition of the Scriptures, he became

¹ Cyril Al. *Epp.* xlv, lxvii, lxix, lxxi (*Op.* x. 135, 195, 198, 199 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 229, 336, 340, 344).

² For Theodore, see Bardenhewer, 318-23 ; H. B. Swete in *D. C. B.* iv. 934-8 ; Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 13-21 ; and for his works, *P. G.* lxvi, esp. the 'fragmenta dogmatica', 969-1020, reprinted in H. B. Swete, *Theodore of M. on the minor Epistles of St. Paul*, app. A (ii. 289-339). For estimates of Theodore, see A. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv. 107 sq., 409 sq., 430 sq. ; J. A. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, II. i. 28-51, and nn. 380 sq. ; Swete, *Th. on St. Paul*, I. lxxix sq. ; L. G. Mylne in *C. Q. R.* I, No. 1 (Jan. 1875), and C. Gore in *C. Q. R.* xvi, No. 3 (July 1883) ; W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 159 ; and *Dissertatio* I, § 9, in *M. M.* (*P. L.* xlvi. 1149-54).

³ *Vita* in *P. G.* lxvi. 11-22.

⁴ Socr. *H. E.* vi. iii, §§ 4-6 ; Soz. *H. E.* viii. ii, § 7.

⁵ Chrysostom, *Ep.* cxii (*Op.* iii. 655 ; *P. G.* lii. 668 sq.).

⁶ See 'De Th. scriptis' in *P. G.* lxvi. 21-78.

what he is still with the East Syrians and others, *par excellence* 'The Interpreter'. As such, he carried the principles of the Antiochene School to their limit, and manifested 'an excessive jealousy for the literal truth' of the text.¹ It was not enough to dispense with allegorism altogether. He even 'rejected much of the prophetic and typical import of the Holy Scriptures.'² Thus, in the commentary on the *Psalms*,³ composed when he was barely twenty, he acknowledged only four Psalms as Messianic, viz. ii, viii, xlv, cx. The *Book of Job*⁴ was simply a drama; the *Song of Songs*⁵ no more than an *epithalamium*. Interesting to us as are these anticipations of modern criticism of the Old Testament, they were too merely negative to last; and led their author to so limited a view of the Canon as that he not only excluded *Job* and *Song of Songs* from the Old Testament but the *Catholic Epistles* from the New Testament. His *Commentary on the minor Epistles of St. Paul*⁶ has reached us entire, though in Latin; his *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*⁷ in Syriac. But more important, for our purpose, are the fragments of his dogmatic writings.⁸ One of them, *Adversus asserentem peccatum in natura situm esse*,⁹ was an attack on Jerome and Augustine, with a very clever title. It places Theodore on the Pelagian side: and this is unquestionably the explanation—though he may have been all unconscious¹⁰ of the connexion¹¹—of his defective theory of the Incarnation. 'His errors', says Dr. Swete, 'are mainly due to an imperfect realization of the nature and extent of human sin. With Theodore sin is a weakness rather than a disease, a negative rather than a positive evil. . . . With the true estimate of the evil of sin, the necessity for an actual Incarnation of the Eternal Word disappears; a man indissolubly united to God through the permanent indwelling of the Word suffices. . . . It is not that he does not attach due importance to the moral side of human nature; his constant assertion of the [power of the will] abundantly proves the contrary.' Indeed, it was against Apollinaris, and to reassert the reality of our Lord's human example which Apollinarianism destroyed, that Theodore took the field. 'But he fails to recognize the depth of the spiritual

¹ Swete, *Th. on St. Paul*, I. lxxxvii.

² Ibid.

³ *P. G.* lxvi. 647-96.

⁴ Ibid. 697 sq.

⁵ Ibid. 699 sq.

⁶ Ed. H. B. Swete, 2 vols. (1880).

⁷ *P. G.* lxvi. 727-86.

⁸ Ibid. 969-1020; Swete, ii. 289-339.

⁹ *P. G.* lxvi. 1005-12; Swete, ii. 332-7.

¹⁰ Swete, I. lxxxvi sq.

¹¹ F. R. Tennant, *Sources, &c.*, 327 sq.

disease [of our human nature], and this failure affects his entire conception of the restorative system which is revealed throughout the New Testament, and in no part of it more distinctly than in the Epistles of St. Paul.’¹ For these defective theories of the Person of Christ, the evidence is to be found in his *De Incarnatione*² and his *Adversus Apollinarem*³; treatises preserved, it is true, in fragments only, but of quantity sufficient to make it certain that, whether or no Nestorius himself was a Nestorian, Theodore, at any rate, was a Nestorian before Nestorius.

§ 4. We now turn to the doctrine of Theodore.

It was the doctrine of Diodore developed, and sprang from the same motives—distrust of Apollinarianism and zeal for the reality of our Lord’s human example which Apollinarianism undermined. Theodore was afraid that to accentuate the divine side of the Saviour’s being would end in removing him far away from any true sympathy with us as well as from our power to imitate Him. And, apart from Apollinaris, there had already been Catholic writers such as Clement of Alexandria and Hilary, bishop of Poitiers 350–†68, who had represented the acts of our Lord, in His manhood, as condescensions. ‘He ate and drank’, says Clement, ‘only to forestall Docetism’⁴—a view that is itself semi-Docetic.⁵ ‘His ignorance’, says Hilary, ‘was an economy.’⁶ ‘He took food and drink, not because His body needed sustenance, but in conformity to custom.’⁷ Theodore was anxious for a Saviour with experiences really like our own. He insisted that the manhood taken by the Word is a ‘complete manhood, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting’.⁸ So completely man is the Saviour that He grew—so far as He was man—like other boys, not only in body but in wisdom,⁹ in knowledge of good and evil, in experiences of all sorts. He had his temptations, nor were they merely from outside. Indeed, He was troubled by passions both of the soul and of the body, and knew what the struggle with concupiscence was¹⁰—an assertion

¹ Swete, i. lxxxvii.

² Ibid. ii. 290–312; *P. G.* lxvi. 969–94.

³ *P. G.* lxvi. 993–1004; Swete, ii. 312–22.

⁴ Clem. Al. *Strom.* vi. ix, § 71 (*Op.* ii. 276; *P. G.* ix. 292 c).

⁵ C. Bigg, *Chr. Platonists*², 102.

⁶ Hilary, *De Trin.* ix, § 62 (*Op.* ii. 307; *P. L.* x. 331 B).

⁷ Ibid. x, § 24 (*Op.* ii. 339; *P. L.* x. 364 B).

⁸ Theodore, *Exp. Symb.* (Swete, ii. 328, ll. 23 sq.).

⁹ Theodore’s comments on Luke ii. 52 in Swete, ii. 297 sq., 335, ll. 17 sq.

¹⁰ Theodore, *De Inc.* (Swete, 311).

in which Theodore's fundamental Pelagianism comes out; for Julian of Eclanum, who took refuge with him, was the only other thinker to venture upon this daring affirmation.¹ Theodore would say that it was a condition of moral progress, as in us, so in the Saviour. But 'He had an exceptional bent towards virtue, owing to His union with God the Word'.² He speedily won the victory, therefore, and completely. From the Resurrection onwards³ He was 'exempt from the possibility of a moral fall',⁴ and so indissolubly united to God.⁵

What then is this Union? Theodore designated it by various terms—Union⁶ (ένωσις), Conjunction⁷ (συνάφεια), Relation⁸ (σχέσις), Indwelling⁹ (ἐνοίκησις). He exhibits a preference for the last, because it is a figure found in Scripture¹⁰; and, as such, it was popular at Antioch and had been employed by Diodore. It is in explanation of the Divine Indwelling in Jesus that Theodore gives us the clearest view of the way in which he conceived the union of God and man in Him. The intimacy of the Divine Indwelling in our Lord was confessedly unique. Not, indeed, that God dwelt in Jesus by His essence (οὐσία): an essential indwelling of God in a creature is excluded by the first principles of Theism. Nor merely by His operation (ἐνέργεια): for by His operation God is everywhere present, and a presence of this sort would constitute no peculiar privilege for the Saviour. No, the Divine Indwelling in Him was unique: it was of God's good pleasure (εὐδοκία)¹¹—as indeed the accounts of the Baptism¹² and the Transfiguration¹³ tell us. 'But in this sense,' it might be objected, 'God dwells, according to Scripture, in His saints.' 'True,' replied Theodore, 'but in Jesus He dwells, according to

¹ W. Bright, *Later Treatises of St. Ath.* 109, 128, and Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, ii. 437, iii. 14, n. 7. Only Julian and Theodore maintained the peccability of our Lord. Many affirmed His sinlessness; Catholics His impeccability, e. g. 'Hanc cupiditatem Christus et sentire posset, si haberet; et habere, si vellet; sed absit ut vellet', Aug. *Op. imp. c. Iul.* iv, § 48 (*Op.* x. 1161 c; *P. L.* xlv. 1366). If we say that, in order to be a sympathetic Saviour, He must be capable of moral fall, then we deprive Him of a higher office, viz. His power to restore. 'A peccable Christ could not be a life-giving Christ,' W. Bright, *Age of the Fathers*, ii. 262; and see also *Sermons of St. Leo* ², 142 sq.

² Theodore, *De Inc.* vii (Swete, ii. 296 sq.).

³ Ibid. 297, ll. 2-8.

⁴ Ibid. 296 sq.

⁵ Theodore, *Exp. Symb.* (Swete, ii. 330, l. 2).

⁶ Swete, ii. 296, l. 5.

⁷ Ib. ii. 306, l. 18.

⁸ Ib. ii. 300, l. 26, 308, l. 16, 310, l. 20.

⁹ Ibid. ii. 294, l. 5.

¹⁰ e. g. Lev. xxvi. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 16.

¹¹ Swete, ii. 294, ll. 27 sq., and i. 142, n. 10.

¹² Matt. iii. 17.

¹³ Mark ix. 7; Matt. xvii. 5.

Scripture, "as in a Son": and this means that, while between the human and the Divine nature in Jesus there is complete distinctness, yet there is also such an unity of will and of operation that the result is one Person.¹ Theodore clearly intended to assert one Person in Christ; and, no doubt, thought that he had provided for an unity of Person in Him that should be sufficient for all purposes of redemption. He even spoke of this union as beginning with our Lord's conception,² and as indissoluble.³ He said there was 'one Person in possession of two natures. True, when we are thinking of the natures apart, each is complete and each is personal. But when we are thinking of their union, then there is in Christ but one Person and one Son.'⁴

Why then was a theory, which paid such deference to traditional language, less than orthodox? Because it really amounted to no more than a moral union, after all: and this Theodore unwarily admitted by comparing the union of divine and human in our Lord to the conjugal union.⁵ Certainly man and wife are 'one flesh'⁶; but after marriage they still remain two persons as before. And Theodore repeatedly spoke not of the union between God and man, but between God and a man, between 'Him who assumed' and 'him who was assumed'.⁷ He may have meant to affirm but one Person; but it looks as if, like other Antiochenes before him, he unconsciously placed the personality of Jesus in his manhood: for Jesus to him was a man who became God not, as to Apollinaris, God who became man. He never really meant that the very Self or *Ego* of the Divine Son entered this worldly sphere.⁸ Mary therefore is *Theotokos*, or Mother of God, only in so far as she was mother of the man who was assumed by God⁹; and Jesus himself could be called Son of God, as Diodore had put it, not in the strict sense but simply as having acquired his Sonship through association with the Word.¹⁰ Theodore must have every credit for his desire to adhere to traditional language about the unity of Christ and to provide for the Christian instinct of wor-

¹ Swete, ii. 295 sq.; and Theodore, *Letter to Domnus*, ap. Swete, ii. 338 sq.

² Ibid. 339.

³ Ib. ii. 330, l. 2.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 299, ll. 18 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. ii. 299, ll. 1 sqq.

⁶ Mark x. 8.

⁷ Swete, ii. 295 sq.

⁸ As in his comments on John i. 14 (Swete, ii. 300, ll. 16 sq.); or on John xx. 22 or on John xx. 28 (*P. G.* lxi. 783), where he takes 'My Lord and my God' not as a confession of the Godhead of our Lord but as a glorification of the Father.

⁹ Swete, ii. 310 ll. 10-21.

¹⁰ Swete, ii. 311 sq., 308, ll. 16 sq.

shipping Him¹; but so preoccupied was he in getting rid of Apollinarianism that he came, first, to overlook the truth which it shared with Catholicism in starting from the thought of God made man; and then, by way of correcting its doctrine of a defective humanity, to affirm explicitly that there was in our Lord's manhood more than human nature—a human person. Thus there were two sons,² one of whom, the son of Mary, was by grace and not by nature,³ as Diodore had said, Son of God, so that Mary was not, except titularly, the mother of God.

It was at this point that Theodore's teaching was taken over and popularized by Nestorianism.

§ 5. Its occasion belongs to the winter of 428-9. Nestorius brought with him from Antioch a number of clergy who were not particularly appreciated by the clergy of the capital.⁴ One of them, Anastasius, his *syncellus*⁵ or domestic chaplain, preached on 22 November 428; and, in the course of his sermon denied that Mary is *Theotokos*. 'Let no one', he cried, 'call Mary the mother of God. For Mary was but human: and it is impossible for God to be born of human kind.'⁶ Some of the congregation protested, and the scandal was great. For the term was current coin, and of long standing in Christendom.⁷ But Nestorius appears to have thought it of Apollinarian origin⁸; and on Christmas Day he began a course of sermons⁹ in support of his

¹ Swete, ii. 359, ll. 15-33; ii. 309, where he says that, since Christ is the Image of God, we worship Him as we adore the Emperor's Images—a name borrowed from Diodore.

² Swete, ii. 303, ll. 16 sq.

³ Ibid. ii. 306, ll. 1-8.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1107 A.

⁵ Fleury, iii. 13, note i.

⁶ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxii, § 2.

⁷ As is observed by Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxii, §§ 14-18. He ascribes its earliest use to Origen, *Comm. in Rom.* i. 5 (*Op.* iv. 406, n. 32; *P. G.* xiv. 850 c), in a passage now lost at that point. It was common in the fourth century, e. g. Alexander, bp. of Al., *ap. Thdt. H. E.* i. iv, § 54; Eus. *V. C.* iii, § 43; Ath. *Orat. c. Ar.* iii, §§ 14, 29, 33 (*Op.* ii. 446; *P. G.* xxvi. 349 c); Cyril, *Cat.* x, § 19 (*Op.* 146; *P. G.* xxxiii. 685 A); Greg. Naz. *Ep.* ci (*Op.* ii. 85 B; *P. G.* xxxvii. 178 c); Greg. Nyss. *Ep.* iii (*Op.* iii. 660; *P. G.* xlvi. 1024 B). The Westerns used 'Mater Dei', e. g. Tert. *De patientia*, c. iii, and Ambrose, *Hexaem.* v, § 65 (*Op.* i. 195; *P. L.* xiv. 233 c). The substance of the title was much older, e. g. Ignatius, *Ad Eph.* vii, § 2, xviii, § 2. See J. Pearson, *On the Creed*⁶, 319 (Oxford, 1878); Newman, *Select Tr.*⁷ ii. 212 (1897); W. Bright, *St. Leo*², 126 sq.

⁸ *Livre d'H.* 154. He regarded it as a 'bogey', Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxii, § 9.

⁹ Scraps from Nestorius are preserved by Marius Mercator, in translation. These are worked up into five sermons in Baluze's edition of M. M. *Op.* 52-90 (Parisii, 1684): Garnier adds other scraps and works them up into thirteen (ed. 1673)=*P. L.* xlvi. 753-864; but for a critical edition, see F. Loofs, *Nestoriana* (1905), and for a review of it, *J. T. S.* viii. 119 sqq. (Oct. 1906).

chaplain. 'Hath God', as Dr. Neale translates his first sermon, 'a mother? Then we may excuse paganism for giving mothers to its divinities. Then was Paul a liar when he testified concerning Christ that He was "without father, without mother, without descent". No: Mary was not the mother of God. For "that which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit". A creature brought not forth Him who is uncreated; the Father begat not of the Virgin an Infant God, the Word; for "in the beginning was the Word", as John saith: a creature bore not the Creator, but rather a man who was the organ of Deity. For the Holy Ghost created not God the Son: and "that which is conceived of her is of the Holy Ghost"; but He fabricated of the Virgin a Temple wherein God the Word should dwell. God was incarnate, but never died; yea, rather, elevated him in whom He was incarnate; He descended to raise that which had fallen, but He fell not Himself. On account of the Employer, then, I venerate the vestment which He employed; on account of that which is concealed, I adore that which appears.'¹ A lawyer named Eusebius, afterwards bishop of Dorylaeum, c. 448-51, stood up and protested that the Eternal Word was born in flesh²: and he was afterwards the author of a placard put up in Constantinople, proclaiming that the archbishop was a heretic of the same sort as his fellow-countryman, Paul of Samosata.³ But this was unfair: Paul did not, and Nestorius did, hold that the Eternal Word was a Person.⁴ The opposition of Eusebius, nevertheless, illustrates the trend of opinion in the city. The Court stood by Nestorius; but clergy, monks, and people either withdrew in silence or pronounced against him. An archimandrite, Basil by name, with a deputation of monks, went to the episcopal palace to remonstrate. Nestorius had them relegated to the prison that was attached to it.⁵ The bishop's prison reminds us of the dungeon at Peel near St. German's; and both recall the consequences of that intimate union between Church and State which gave direct coercive jurisdiction to the Spirituality.

¹ J. M. Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 236; Latin and Greek in Loofs, *Nest.* 252 sq., 262, ll. 3, 4. ² Cyril, *Adv. Nest.* i, § 4 (*Op.* ix. 20; *P. G.* lxxvi. 41 D).

³ Mansi, iv. 1008-12, and the *Epistola* of Marius Mercator (*P. L.* xlviii. 773 sq.).

⁴ N. himself treats the theory of the Paulinians as heretical, and describes it much in the form in which it was attributed to himself, *Livre d'H.* 43.

⁵ See their petition to the Emperor, § 4 (Mansi, iv. 1105 A, B); Fleury, xxv. v.

But the opposition continued, and on Lady Day, 429, Proclus, the bishop intended for Cyzicus and afterwards patriarch of Constantinople, was appointed to preach. In the presence of Nestorius, he delivered a panegyric 'on the Virgin mother of God'.¹ 'It is the feast of the Virgin', he said, § 1, 'in whose womb the incircumscribed God found an habitation.'² God, § 2, was born of a woman, but not bare God; man too was born of her, but not mere man. Be not ashamed, O man, § 3, of that birth: it was the means of our salvation. If God had not been born, He could not have died; if He had not died, He could not have destroyed him that had the power of death, i.e. the devil. If the Word had never dwelt in the Virgin's womb, then Flesh had never ascended the Father's throne. Quite right, § 4, was St. Paul in speaking of Him as "without father, and without mother". He is without a mother as the Creator, without a father as the created'. Proclus then went on, § 5, to dwell on the debt which human nature owed and its entire inability to pay; and he described how God took our manhood in order to pay it, but in language too suggestive of the price being paid to the devil.³ Next, § 6, he passes from the incompatibility of the new doctrine with the atonement to its effect upon our conception of the God-head. 'If Christ be one, § 8, and the Word another, then,' he insists, 'we have no longer a Trinity but a Quaternity.' Returning to the Incarnation, 'the Lord', he says, § 9, 'came to save: but, in so doing, to suffer. A mere man could not save: a mere God could not suffer. So God became man. That which was, saved: and that which was made, suffered.' And so the preacher concluded, in a magnificent peroration, with setting forth the antitheses of the Incarnation. They are rhetoric of course, but empty rhetoric if Mary is not *Theotokos*. But if she be so, then 'the

¹ q.v. in *P. G.* lxxv. 679-92; Marius M. (*P. L.* xlviii. 775-81); *Conc. Eph.* i, § 2 (Mansi, iv. 577-87), and, for a summary, Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 239 sq.; Fleury, xxv. ii.

² Here Proclus, perhaps, raises the dignity of Mary too high; or, rather, seems to dwell on it for its own sake, apart from his purpose, which was to assert the personal divinity of our Lord. 'Absit', indeed 'ut quisquam S. Mariam Divinae gratiae privilegiis et speciali gloria fraudare conetur' (J. Pearson, *On the Creed*, 321, n. 40); but in Θεοτόκος, Θεός is a predicate. It means 'she whose Son was God', and it was this that Proclus was concerned to assert. He did a little flourishing for its own sake, first; perhaps, to satisfy the florid and grandiose taste of that day.

³ For other examples of the theory of the ransom being paid to the devil see the note in Greg. Nyss. *Oratio Catechetica*, c. xxiii (89, n. 2, ed. J. H. Srawley).

Self-same was in the Father's bosom and in the womb of His mother. He lay in a mother's arms, while He walked upon the wings of the wind. He was adored by angels, while He sat at meat with publicans. The Cherubim durst not behold Him, while Pilate condemned Him. The servant smote Him, and creation shuddered. He hung upon the Cross, but He was not absent from the throne of glory; and, while he lay in the tomb, He was spreading out the heavens like a curtain. Oh! what mystery! § 10, I see the miracles, and I proclaim the Godhead: I behold the sufferings, and I deny not the manhood. What clearer proof could I want that Mary is mother of God indeed?'—

The oratory of Proclus was greeted with prolonged applause; and Nestorius was a bold man to claim his right, as bishop, to sum up or, if need be, to correct the teaching given by his clergy from the pulpit,¹ and begin an extemporized answer. 'No wonder', he said, 'that these applauses are considered due to the praises of Mary; the Temple of the Lord's flesh exceeds all praise.'² But a little later he spoke of Jesus Himself as the Temple. 'To say that God was born of Mary is to give a handle of unbelief to the pagans³; to say that God was joined to the Son of Mary is firm and impregnable ground.⁴ Surely the people of Constantinople were not inferior in theological knowledge to those of Antioch: surely they would not endure to be told, as they had just been, that "God was made an High Priest"⁵ . . . If the Quickener of all could die, where is He that shall give life to us?⁶ To confuse the Persons of our Lord is to put arms in the hands of the Arians: the Catholic Truth is far otherwise to be enunciated. He who inhabited the Temple [here the Temple is not Mary, but Jesus] is one thing; the Temple which He inhabited is another. It is the Lord's own declaration: "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it again."⁷ By nature, then, Christ is two: in so far as He is the Son, one.'⁸ So Dr. Neale summarizes the answer of Nestorius.⁹ Whether or no it was all delivered as and when represented by the collectors of his utterances, the phrases

¹ For this custom of several sermons, concluded by that of the bishop, see the Liturgy of the Apost. Const.—good evidence for Antioch, 375—in F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies*, i. 29, ll. 41-2.

² *Sermo*, iv. § 1; M. M. (*P. L.* xlviii. 782 A).

³ *Ibid.*, § 2 (782 B).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 3 (782 c).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 5 (783 A).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 7 (784 A).

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 10 (784 sq.).

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 12 (784 sq.).

⁹ *Patr. Al.* i. 241 sq.

they report are his¹; and his answer was not without its effect. It was further elaborated in what are given as three sermons² of this date, just after Easter, 429, dealing with three statements of Proclus that 'Mary is mother of God', that 'God was made High Priest', and that 'God was born and died'. 'God', says Nestorius in the first, 'passed through the Virgin mother of Christ: that God was born of her is never asserted in Holy Scripture. It always uses such expressions as that Christ, the Son, the Lord was born of her. It says "the young child and His mother", not "God and His mother".'³ In the last⁴ he taught that it was not God but Jesus who died and rose again⁵; and, like Theodore, he took the confession of St. Thomas, "My Lord and my God", as a doxology to the Father.⁶ There are places which look as if Nestorius took his opponents to mean that the Godhead was born⁷ and died⁸; but, let that misunderstanding be removed, and there still remains the apparent difference between the adherents of Proclus and the school of Nestorius that while they believed in one Divine Person in Christ, he did not.

§ 6. An examination, at this point, of the theology of Nestorius, specially as illustrated by his own *Book of Heraclides*,⁹ is imperative if we are to decide whether this were so. The treatise, according to the preface of the scholar who translated it into Syriac,¹⁰ consists of two books. In Book I the author first combats the heresies contrary to the Faith of Nicaea¹¹; then he proceeds to an attack upon Cyril, in the course of which he examines his judges at the Council of Ephesus and the charges of Cyril;¹² then, with his own defence and a review of their letters,¹³ he brings Book I to an end. Book II opens with a refutation of the charges on which he was excommunicated,¹⁴ and then gives the history from the time of his deposition to the close of his life.¹⁵

¹ They are assigned to him, as his, on this occasion against Proclus, by Loofs, *Nest.* 337-41; q.v. for a better text.

² *Sermones*, v-vii of M. M. (*P. L.* xlvi. 785-80): they were answered by Cyril, *Adv. Nest.* (*Op.* x. 9-143; *P. G.* lxxvi. 9-248).

³ *Serm.* v, § 9 (*P. L.* xlvi. 787 D; Loofs, *Nest.* 278).

⁴ Loofs, *Nest.* 265-77.

⁵ *Sermo*, vii, § 7 (*P. L.* xlvi. 792 A; Loofs, *Nest.* 267, l. 14).

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 8 (792 B; Loofs, *Nest.* 267 sq.).

⁷ *Sermo*, v, § 2 (*P. L.* xlvi. 787 C; Loofs, *Nest.* 277 sq.).

⁸ *Sermo*, vii, § 4 (*P. L.* xlvi. 791 A; Loofs, *Nest.* 266).

⁹ Ed. P. Bedjan (Leipzig, 1910), and 'traduit en français par F. Nau' (Paris, 1910).

¹⁰ F. Nau, 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 5-81.

¹² *Ibid.* 81-125.

¹³ *Ibid.* 126-63.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 164-294.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 294-332.

(1) On the whole, the treatise is more of an attack upon Cyril than a defence of himself.¹ Nestorius was alarmed at the tendencies of the Cyrilline theology, the development of which we must, for the moment, anticipate. He held that it involved two dangers. There was the danger of a revival of Apollinarianism: for Cyril, in referring to our Lord's manhood, never spoke of His human 'nature' (φύσις).² 'He made Him', says Nestorius, 'a man without person (πρόσωπον) and without nature (φύσις)' ³; as if His were an incomplete humanity. There was also the danger, as with Arius, of a reversion to paganism: for Cyril seemed to make 'the Godhead subject to change, and diminution and suffering'.⁴ This is the key to the dislike which Nestorius felt for the term *Theotokos*.⁵ He did not hold, as he was often charged with holding because of his dislike of the term, that the Child born of Mary was a human babe afterwards associated by the Divine Word with Himself. Nay, he affirmed that from the first moment of the human life, it was indissolubly associated with the Word.⁶ So he did not repudiate *Theotokos*. But he demurred to it ⁷; and that, on the ground of its paganism.⁸ 'I have said many a time that, if any simple soul among you or anywhere else finds pleasure in the term, I have no objection to it. Only do not let him make the Virgin a goddess.'⁹ Here the caution is not against Mariolatry but against paganism; as if the *Godhead* of Mary's Son were derived from her. It was a similar dread of constructive paganism that prompted him to declare that he could never say 'God was three or four months old'.¹⁰ Not that he could not own

¹ A. J. Mason, *The Chalcedonian doctrine of the Incarnation*, 23.

² Thus he would write τὴν τοῦ Λόγου φύσιν (*De recta fide ad Reginas*, I, § 25 [*Op.* ix. 147; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1368 c]), or τὸ εἶναι φύσιν Θεός (*ibid.*, § 27 [*Op.* ix. 149; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1369]); and in the parallel passages, where we should expect τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν, we never have it, but τὸ ἀνθρώπινον (*ibid.*, § 25), or τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα (*ibid.*, § 27), &c.; and, for a collection of further instances, see Nau, xiii, n. 2.

³ Mason, 24.

⁴ *Ibid.* 26: see Nau, 131.

⁵ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 32.

⁶ Nau, 173.

⁷ 'Θεοδόχον dico, non Θεοτόκον . . . unus est enim Pater Deus Θεοτόκος,' Loofs, 276.

⁸ He preferred the term Χριστοτόκος, where the word 'Christ' indicates the two natures, as Scriptural (Matt. i. 1, 16) and as cutting short the difficulties attaching to Θεοτόκος on the one hand, and to ἀνθρωποτόκος [which he sometimes urged, Loofs, 303, 309] on the other: see Loofs, 171, 181 sq.; Nau, 91 sq.

⁹ Loofs, 272; for passages in which he thus accepts the term, but with a preference for supplementing it by ἀνθρωποτόκος, see Loofs, 167, 181, 184 sq., 191 sq., 301 sq., 309, 312, 319.

¹⁰ Nau, 122; and, on his real meaning, *C. Q. R.* vol xxiii. 304 (Jan. 1912).

a child of three or four months to be God¹; but that to predicate time of God was to revert to paganism. There was, then, in the view of Nestorius, something wrong with Cyril's way of conceiving and stating the unity of Person in Christ, if it involved consequences such as these—an incomplete humanity and a passible Godhead.

(2) What then was his own way of providing for it? and how did he propose to secure, along with the unity of Person in Christ, both the completeness of His humanity and the impassibility of His Godhead? By supposing 'a Divine agent and a human agent' in Him, 'absolutely yet freely united'.² After such union there was no mixture³ or confusion⁴; no deifying therefore of the manhood and no lowering of the Godhead. Christ is twofold in nature: there is in Him a distinction of Godhead and manhood.⁵ These two elements are each to be thought of as a *πρόσωπον* or living whole. 'Even in the union, the natures remain without confusion. The natures are not without their respective *πρόσωπα* nor the *πρόσωπα* without their respective essences.'⁶ But, it would be objected, this means two Christs and two Sons. Nestorius persistently repudiated the inference.⁷ 'Son,' 'Christ,' 'Lord,' he replied, are titles given in Scripture, not to the one or the other element in His being, but to Himself⁸—the Person Incarnate. We must therefore suppose, he argues, a kind of 'give and take between the two *πρόσωπα*'⁹; and, as its consequence, a resultant *πρόσωπον*,¹⁰ i.e. 'but one *πρόσωπον* for the two natures',¹¹ if we are to give the only reasonable explanation of the one Christ. Nestorius could therefore say, 'I separate the natures, but I unite the worship'¹²; and, when charged with setting up a merely moral union in Christ, he could reply that it is a union of will and not of essence, but at the same time maintain that 'so far

¹ This, however, is the form in which the saying was quoted against him in Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 5, where Θεόν is a predicate, not a subject; and this makes all the difference; cf. Mansi, iv. 1181 c; Fleury, xxv. xl.

² Mason, 28.

³ *κρᾶσις*, Loofs, 273.

⁴ *σύγχυσις*, Loofs, 224.

⁵ Loofs, 281; Nau, 286.

⁶ Nau, 273.

⁷ Loofs, 281; Nau, 286.

⁸ Loofs, 273 sq.

⁹ Nau, 233.

¹⁰ Ibid. 127 sq., 132, 146, 282.

¹¹ Ibid. 194. *Πρόσωπον* means, in this book, less than 'Person'. It = a complete nature, e. g. 145. The difficulty of Nestorius was that he could not conceive of a nature [*sc.* Christ's human nature] complete, but impersonal, and therefore capable of attaching to His Divine Person: see Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 26, n. 58; and for the impersonality of our Lord's Human Nature, see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 137 sq., 143, 150.

¹² Loofs, 262.

from God the Word being one person and the man, in whom He is, another, it is One and the Self-same in two natures and yet One Christ, Son and Lord'.¹

(3) It would appear then that, according to Nestorius, 'the Incarnation has set up a new person, composed of the Word and of the human person conjoined with Him. The new person is called "Christ", "Son" and "Lord"; and it is this person, not the Divine Word, who is the subject of all the experiences which Cyril ascribed to the Word Himself.'² Mary, therefore, is not *Theotokos* but *Christotokos*, or mother of the resultant person. The Nicene Creed, argued Nestorius, speaks of 'Jesus Christ' and not of the Word as 'incarnate . . . crucified . . . raised again'.³ But he forgot that between subject and predicate of this sentence stood 'God of God . . . of one substance with the Father'. It was, then, 'the only-begotten Son of God, a Person antecedent to and not resultant from the Incarnation, the same both before and after that event, who took upon Him our nature and so was the continuous subject of experiences, human in succession to divine.' Nestorius therefore failed to establish the unity of Christ by his theory of two *πρόσωπα*—the Word and the human person—making use of each other in a composite Person; and he did not succeed in avoiding the assertion of two persons in Christ, after all. 'The Word of God', he says, 'is the God of Christ'⁴: where 'Christ' must necessarily stand not for the composite Person but for the human element in his double being. On the point, then, that, according to Nestorius, for all his efforts to escape the conclusion,⁵ there were in Christ two beings and not one Divine Person, Cyril was in the right. He had far greater

¹ Loofs, 224.

² Ibid. 269: see also 166, 171, 217, 259, 266, and Nau 131-3.

³ In his second letter to Cyril = Cyril, *Ep. v* (*Op. x. 26; P. G. lxxvii. 52 A*); and Loofs, 175 sq.

⁴ Loofs, 291 sq., 340: see Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 31.

⁵ We may quite admit 'that Nestorius was clear in his own mind that his doctrine of the Incarnation safeguarded absolutely the unity of the subject. He did not think of two distinct persons joined together but of a single Person who combined in himself the two distinct things (substances) Godhead and manhood with their characteristics (natures) complete and intact though united in Him' (B.-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, 87); but, with MM. Bedjan and Nau, 'we cannot forget that "the two Natures" in the teaching of Nestorius involve two distinct *hypostases* and two persons (*πρόσωπα*) united in one by simple give and exchange, so that it is certain that, even with the *Book of Heraclides* as his defence, Nestorius would nevertheless have been condemned as a heretic', *C. Q. R. lxxiii. 305*: see Bedjan, xiii; Nau, xxviii.

gifts of theological penetration than Nestorius ; and he was now convinced that teaching was being given which would render redemption through the Incarnate impossible.

§ 7. So Cyril intervened, 429, to bring his rival to book. It was not the first time that the see of Alexandria had seized its opportunity to humble the see of Constantinople. Maximus the Cynic had ousted Gregory ; Theophilus had hunted down Chrysostom. Nor was it to be the last : Dioscorus trampled the life out of Flavian. Racial hatred, political animosities, ecclesiastical rivalries and personal jealousies all combined to exasperate theological differences. They went on increasing in bitterness till the seventh century, when the judgement came : and Eastern Christendom was delivered over into the hands of the Moslems. But, for all that, Cyril was led to intervene 'mainly by a warm interest in religion,' as Dorner, who blames him for his 'partiality',¹ admits. Cyril, he says, had 'a far clearer perception of the religious importance of the question than had the Antiochenes', and 'was anxious that God's marvellous love manifested in the Incarnation should not suffer the least diminution of its glory'.²

§ 8. By Epiphany, 429, Cyril had written, as usual, his *Paschal Letter* or *Homily* for the year.³ He would not have heard of the sermons of Nestorius at Christmas ; but he might have heard of the sermon of Anastasius delivered a month earlier. For he discusses the Incarnation ; expresses the unity of the Divinity with the humanity by the term 'commingled'⁴—a term traditional since Tertullian,⁵ but soon to be put away as dangerously suggestive of fusion ; and explains that *Theotokos*, for which he also uses,⁶ as Constantine had used at Nicaea,⁷ Μητρὶς Θεοῦ or Mother of God, carries with it the birth of the Divine Person in His manhood.⁸ Meanwhile, the sermons of Nestorius were collected, and circulated far and wide both in East and West. They found

¹ J. A. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, II. i. 57.

² Ibid. 60.

³ Cyril, *Hom. Pasch.* xvii (*Op.* x. 222-35 ; *P. G.* xvii. 767-800) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 330 ; Fleury, xxv. iii ; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 237 sq.

⁴ ἀνακίρνυς, *Hom. Pasch.* xvii, § 2 (*Op.* x. 228 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 777 A). The term is considerably safeguarded and qualified here ; as also it is both illustrated and safeguarded by Cyril's use of the figures of the Burning Bush (*ibid.*, § 3 ; *Op.* x. 231 [*P. G.* lxxvii. 781 D]), and of the union of fire and iron in a red-hot mass (*ibid.*, § 4 ; *Op.* x. 231 [*P. G.* lxxvii. 785 D]).

⁵ 'Hominem Deo mixtum,' Tert. *De carne Christi*, § 15. On this see note *ad loc.* in *L. F.* x. 48.

⁶ *Hom. Pasch.* xvii, §§ 2, 3 (*Op.* x. 227-8 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 776 C, 777 C).

⁷ *Orat. ad sanct.*, § 11 ; Eus. *Op.* ii. 581 (*P. G.* xx. 1265 A).

⁸ *Hom. Pasch.* xvii, § 2 (*Op.* x. 227 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 776 C).

their way to the cells of Egypt; and, as Cyril was informed by some of the ascetics on a visit to Alexandria, led some of the brethren to think of our Lord no longer as God but as a mere instrument of the Godhead or a God-bearing man.¹

§ 9. This was the situation that evoked, about Easter, 429, the encyclical letter of Cyril *Ad monachos Aegypti*.² 'I have heard', he says, 'of discussions among you about *Theotokos*.³ I am astonished that the question should ever have been raised as to whether the Holy Virgin should be called Mother of God: for it really amounts to asking, Is her Son God, or is He not?⁴ It is true that the Apostles did not make use of this expression. But the Fathers and, in particular, Athanasius employ it; nor was any one more loyal to Scripture than he.⁵ I shall be told, of course, that it does not occur in the Creed of Nicaea.⁶ But, in that Creed, it is not 'Jesus Christ' simply but 'Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God . . . of one substance with the Father' who is spoken of as having 'come down from heaven' and as 'Incarnate'.⁷ Then he proceeded to the further objection, Is not Mary then the mother of the Godhead?⁸ and concludes with a lengthy argument from Scripture,⁹ e.g. from *Phil.* ii. 6, that it was the Son of God who humbled Himself to take upon Him the form of a servant. The letter speedily reached Nestorius,¹⁰ through Cyril's ecclesiastical agents at Constantinople; for Rome and Alexandria were both in the habit of maintaining *Apocrisiarii*¹¹ or *Responsales* or, as we might say, nuncios, at Court. Some of the magistrates wrote and thanked him for it.¹² But Nestorius was annoyed by it. He set one Photius to reply to it, in a pamphlet that is now lost but which Cyril received through his agent, a deacon resident in the city¹³; and he suborned¹⁴ certain Alex-

¹ Cyril, *Ep.* ii (*Op.* x. 20; *P. G.* lxxvii. 40 sq.).

² *Ep.* i (*Op.* x. 1-19; *P. G.* lxxvii. 9-39); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. iii (Mansi, iv. 587-618); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 328; Fleury, xxv. iii; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 244.

³ *Ep.* i, § 3.

⁴ *Ep.* i, § 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*; he quotes Ath. *Orat.* c. Ar. iii, §§ 29, 33 (*Op.* ii. 459, 462; *P. G.* xxvi. 385 B, 393 A).

⁶ He quotes it in the original form: for Egypt, as yet, knew no other, *ibid.*, § 6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 12.

⁹ *Ibid.*, §§ 13-27.

¹⁰ *Ep.* ii (*Op.* x. 20; *P. G.* lxxvii. 40 c).

¹¹ J. C. Suicer, *Thes. Eccl.* i. 456; F. Cabrol, *Dict. d'arch. chr.* i. 2537 sqq.; *D. C. A.* ii. 969.

¹² Cyril, *Ep.* xi, § 4 (*Op.* x. 38; *P. G.* lxxvii. 81 c).

¹³ *Ep.* x (*Op.* x. 33; *P. G.* lxxvii. 64 d).

¹⁴ Cyril, *Apol. ad Theod. Imp.* (*Op.* ix. 257; *P. G.* lxxvi. 481 d).

andrian refugees¹ in Constantinople to accuse their archbishop before Theodosius. The question had now become one of general public interest, as between Alexandria and Constantinople. Pope Caelestinus and a Roman Council had heard of it. They wrote to Cyril; informed him that they too had received copies of the sermons of Nestorius; would he kindly let them know if they were really his? ² John of Antioch, however, took no action as yet. Theologically, he was, on the whole, in agreement with Cyril; but he was a personal friend of Nestorius.

§ 10. It was to reclaim Nestorius that Cyril, urged by his colleagues, now sent to Constantinople *Advenērunt*, his *First letter to Nestorius*,³ June 429. 'I am told', he says, 'that you are leaving no stone unturned to injure me at Court. But it was not my letter to the monks which caused the prevailing excitement: it was some papers or other, whether proceeding from you or not, that were circulated here, which did it. I must take some steps to put matters right. Inquiries from Caelestinus, bishop of Rome, and complaints from the Eastern churches, make it incumbent upon me. Your language has given deep offence. Yet if you would but recognize the one word *Theotokos*, you would at once recover your reputation for orthodoxy, and at the same time restore peace to the Church.' The letter was dispatched to Constantinople by Lampon, a presbyter of Alexandria. It can scarcely be called conciliatory. But Nestorius was not to be provoked. 'The importunity of Lampon', he replied, 'has wrung from me these few lines. There is a good deal, as I must confess, in your letter which ill befits brotherly charity; but I prefer, if possible, to persist in our old friendly relations.'⁴ Nestorius, it seems, was not ready for a breach just then. And, indeed, he was well advised: for, since his sermons at Christmas, he had lost ground with his own flock and had also compromised himself by a certain degree of understanding with refugee Pelagians. As to his flock, Dorotheus, bishop of Marcianopolis in Moesia, had scandalized them by shouts in church, where Nestorius was seated on his

¹ Cyril, *Epp.* iv, x (*Op.* x. 22, 34; *P. G.* lxxvii. 44 c, 68 A).

² Cyril, *Ep.* ii (*Op.* x. 20; *P. G.* lxxvii. 41 B).

³ *Ep.* ii (*Op.* x. 19-21; *P. G.* lxxvii. 39-42); *Conc. Eph.* i. c. vi (Mansi, iv. 883-6); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 332; Fleury, xxiv. iv; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 246.

⁴ Cyril, *Ep.* iii (*Op.* x. 21; *P. G.* lxxvii. 43); *Conc. Eph.* i. c. vii (Mansi, iv. 885); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 332; Fleury, xxv. iv; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 246.

throne, of 'Anathema to him who calls Mary mother of God'¹; and Nestorius had shown his approval by admitting him to communion then and there.² The people protested, and refused to communicate. Some of the clergy withdrew from his allegiance. Others preached against the teaching of their archbishop, and were inhibited; while their flocks were beaten for shouting, 'We have an Emperor, but not a bishop'.³ Basil and his monks petitioned the Emperor against him; and a priest named Philip held conventicles, and celebrated the Eucharist in a private house.⁴ Senators too, as we have seen, stood aloof. There were, in fact, the beginnings of a schism in the city; but, more than this, Nestorius had been dallying with heretics. For Caelestius, the zealous champion of Pelagianism, had been compelled by Pope Caelestine to leave Italy, 424, and was now in Constantinople: as also were the semi-Pelagian bishops, Julian and others. They had originally taken refuge with Theodore, in Cilicia; but, on his death, had recently joined Caelestius in the capital. Marius Mercator, a layman living there, was as zealous for the doctrine of Grace as for the truth of the Incarnation. He greeted the refugees with a *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii*,⁵ 429, which he presented to the church of Constantinople and to Theodosius II. He narrates the case against Caelestius opened in Africa some twenty years before;⁶ summarizes what befel him later, including his expulsion from Constantinople under 'Atticus of holy memory',⁷ and his condemnation at Rome.⁸ Then he illustrates the opinions of Pelagius,⁹ the master of this newly arrived heretic; and challenges Julian, but just arrived also, 'for the satisfaction of the church, to condemn both Pelagius and Caelestius'.¹⁰ By the testimony of this pamphleteer Nestorius was no Pelagian, yet he treated Julian with kindness and wrote a letter of consolation to Caelestius.¹¹ He preached against

¹ Cyril, *Ep.* xi, § 3 (*Op.* x. 37; *P. G.* lxxvii. 81 B).

² *Ep.* viii (*Op.* x. 30; *P. G.* lxxvii. 60 C).

³ *Libellus Basilii Diaconi* = *Conc. Eph.* i. xxx, § 2 (Mansi, iv. 1104 C).

⁴ Cyril, *Commonitorium* (Mansi, iv. 549 D); and *Ep.* xi (*Op.* x. 40; *P. G.* lxxvii. 85-9).

⁵ *P. L.* xlviii. 63-108. It was written in Greek, 429; and re-edited, in a Latin translation, 431. It is extant only in the Latin. It procured the banishment of the chiefs of the Pelagian party from Constantinople, and contributed to their condemnation by the Council of Ephesus, 431.

⁶ sc. at the Co. of Carthage, 411-12, *Comm.* i, §§ 1, 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁸ *Ibid.*, §§ 4, 5.

⁹ *Ibid.* ii-iv.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* v, § 1.

¹¹ Marius Mercator, *Ad Nest.*, Praef., § 1 (*P. L.* xlviii. 183 sqq.). For the letter of Nestorius to Caelestius, written probably after M. M.'s *Comm.* had

Pelagianism; yet he regarded the Pelagian exiles as injured men. And he even went so far as to hold a Council in which Mercator and others were treated as Manichaeans, while Caelestius was allowed to denounce the priest Philip for that error. Philip, however, was put under the archbishop's ban not on the doctrinal charge but 'for performing the Oblation' in 'a private house—a thing we all do in case of need', said his fellow-clergy,¹ thus indicating that the Communion of the Sick was then given not only from the Reserved Sacrament but by a celebration at home. Nestorius, it is fairly clear, was temporizing. He professed in a letter to Pope Caelestine—probably about Easter, 429—that, as to Julian and his fellow-bishops from the West, he was imperfectly acquainted with the facts of their case.² This could hardly be, for he must have known of their condemnation, eight or ten years earlier, by his predecessor Atticus. But Nestorius was anxious, above all things, not to be faced with a second theological storm, while Cyril was threatening mischief. Indeed, the rest of the letter to the Pope makes his real purpose clear; for he slides off into the controversy about *Theotokos* and seeks to win Caelestine's sympathy for his own point of view.³ The situation, then, of Nestorius toward the end of 429 was precarious, but by no means desperate. He was strong, as the petition of the archimandrite, Basil, observes, 'in the support of powerful personages . . . and, if we are to speak out boldly, of your Majesty'.⁴ Nestorius, in fact, had, for the present, the Imperial ear. He would be likely therefore, as Tillemont sardonically remarks, to have the advantage of numbers.⁵ But Basil and his monks, perhaps for this very reason, included in their petition a demand for an Oecumenical Council.

§ 11. Before that request could be considered, Cyril made a second effort to bring the archbishop to a better mind; and, early in 430, sent *Obloquuntur*,⁶ his *Second Letter to Nestorius*.⁷

procured his banishment, see M. M. transl. of Nestorius, *Epp. tres* (P. L. xlviii. 181 sqq.; Loofs, 172 sq.).

¹ Cyril, *Comm. ad Possidonium*, § 5 (*Op.* x. 40; *P. G.* lxxvii. 88 sq.; Mansi, iv. 549 c, d).

² Nest. *ad Caelest.* *Ep.* i = Caelestine, *Ep.* vi, § 1 (P. L. l. 438 sq.); *Conc. Eph.* i. c. xvi (Mansi, iv. 1021); Loofs, 165.

³ Caelestine, *Ep.* vi, §§ 2-4 (P. L. l. 439-41).

⁴ *Libellus Basilii*, § 4 (Mansi, iv. 1105).

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 323.

⁶ Mansi, vi. 659 c.

⁷ Cyril, *Ep.* iv (*Op.* x. 22-5; *P. G.* lxxvii. 44-50); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. viii (Mansi, iv. 887-92); Fleury, xxv. viii; T. H. Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 104-7, notes 108-15, tr. 253-7, and Document No. 193.

'I am aware', he says, 'of the charges which have been made against me by refugees from Alexandria rightly condemned; but I am unwilling to dwell upon them. Let me rather urge you to reform your doctrine by bringing it into harmony with the teaching of the Fathers, specially of Nicaea. That Council held that "the only-begotten Son" Himself, by nature "begotten from God, even the Father . . . came down, was incarnate, and was made man". What is this but to affirm that there are, in the same Christ, two generations; first, the eternal, by which He derives from the Father; and, second, the temporal, by which He was born of His mother? When we say that He suffered and rose again, we do not mean that the Word suffered in His own nature, for Divinity is impassible; but, because the body, which He appropriated, suffered, we also say that *He* suffered. Similarly, we say that He died. The Divine Word is immortal; but, because His own true body experienced death, we say that *He* himself died for us. Once again, when His flesh was raised, the resurrection is spoken of as His: not as if He fell into corruption—certainly not: but it was *His* body that was again raised. Language of this kind rests upon the Hypostatic Union,¹ i.e. the union of two natures in His one Divine Person. Reject this Personal Union; and the only alternative is "Two Sons", one titularly "Son", and the other possessed of "Sonship", name and thing. And a further consequence of this Personal Union is that Mary is *Theotokos*,² where, of course, we do not mean that the nature of the Word, or His Divinity, received its beginning of existence from her; but just this, that, inasmuch as His body to which the Word was personally united was born of her, He was born after the flesh. I beg you then to join us in so thinking and teaching; for then the unity of the episcopate will remain unbroken.'

The letter was unanswerable in its main contention that the Council of Nicaea was fatal by anticipation to Nestorianism, since its creed takes for granted the continuous personality of the Word who, 'in taking flesh remained', as Cyril puts it, 'what He was before'. And it had the added weight of being a conciliar letter; for it emanated from the Council which usually met at Alexandria just before Lent.³ By the same messenger Cyril

¹ On this, see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo* ², 128 sqq. ² Ibid. 126 sqq.

³ So Fleury infers from the statement that it was written 'in the month of Mechir in the thirteenth indiction', *Conc. Chalc.* II, Actio i (Mansi, vi. 660 c).

wrote to his *Apocrisiarii* in Constantinople.¹ He repudiates the notion of a resultant *Prosôpon*. He would have them inform Nestorius that, 'if he imagines that I, Cyril, am to stand my trial in a Council with him for my judge, he is much mistaken. The parts will be reversed, as has happened before at Councils, and he will find himself the accused.' The reference, of course, is to the affair of Chrysostom. 'But Nestorius and I are at peace, so soon as he abandons his doctrine in favour of the true faith.' Finally, he observes that *Theodochos* or *Christotokos* are just as open to the charge of not occurring in Scripture or Council as *Theotokos*. In similar terms he wrote to a mutual friend of Nestorius and himself,² supposed to be Acacius, metropolitan of Melitene in Armenia II. 'Let but the faith be guaranteed, and no one shall prove a truer friend to Nestorius than I.' But there were tones other than conciliatory in Cyril's communications; and, when Nestorius sat down, in Lent, 430, to compose his reply to 'Pope Cyril',³ as the address runs, he wrote in a vein less courteous than on the previous occasion. He praises Cyril for disclaiming the notion that the Word, in His own Nature, was capable of suffering. But was that disclaimer worth much? Was it not cancelled, in effect, by language which had all the appearance of predicating suffering and death of the Divine Word Himself?⁴ Then he makes capital out of texts on the Lord's Humanity, as showing that to it belonged the nativity, and other human experiences.⁵ So closely connected was it with the Godhead that the Godhead might be said to appropriate its actions⁶; and the connexion, he admits, issued in 'One Person'—*prosôpon*—called Christ.⁷ Mary therefore had better be entitled *Christotokos*; for *Theotokos* is pagan, and involves the notion that the Godhead was born of her.⁸ Finally, he insinuates that Cyril has been misinformed by persons—he means Marius Mercator and others—whom a Council of Constantinople had condemned for Manichaeans, and by his own clergy; and he ends with the significant hint that not only are the affairs

¹ *Ep.* x (*Op.* x. 32-5; *P. G.* lxxvii. 63-70); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xii (Mansi, iv. 1003-8); and, in Latin, *M. M.* (*P. L.* xlvi. 808-17); Fleury, xxv. ix.

² *Ep.* ix (*Op.* x. 31-2; *P. G.* lxxvii. 61-4); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xi (Mansi, iv. 899-1002); Fleury, xxv. ix.

³ *Nest. ad Cyrillum*, II; Loofs, 173 sqq.; = Cyril, *Ep.* v (*Op.* x. 25-9; *P. G.* lxxvii. 49-58); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. ix (Mansi, iv. 892-1000); Fleury, xxv. x; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 248 sq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 2 (Mansi, iv. 896).

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 3.

of the Church going well in the capital but their Imperial Majesties are quite satisfied that the pure doctrine is being taught.¹

§ 12. The hint was not lost upon Cyril; for it was the occasion of a triad of treatises which he next addressed to Theodósios II and the Imperial ladies in order to detach the Court, if possible, from sympathy with Nestorius. They are all entitled *De recta fide*.²

In the first, which was addressed to the Emperor, Cyril, without naming Nestorius, attacks his opinions; and argues that as the position of the Docetists, of Photinus, or the Apollinarian conception of a mindless Christ is unsound, so, on the other hand, it is no less grave an error to separate 'by a coarse division'³ the one Christ into two. He must be recognized as a single Being in two spheres of action.⁴ Else what will become of salvation—he asks, in effect—if you divide the Christ? What of the satisfaction wrought by His death? And, just as Augustine had argued from the received practice of the Baptism and Communion of infants to the truth, which Pelagius denied, of Original Sin,⁵ so Cyril reasoned from the Eucharist to the Incarnate Person. 'Christ gives us life', he says, 'as God, not only by imparting to us the Holy Ghost, but by giving us His flesh to eat.'⁶ How, then, can it be life-giving, if it be not the flesh of the Incarnate Word? Cyril's zeal for orthodoxy may have been unrestrained; but he never lost sight of the interests of personal religion, i.e. of the needs of the soul.

The second treatise he addressed to the Emperor's two younger sisters, Arcadia and Marina. In this, he gives extracts⁷ from Athanasius and other Fathers to show that they made use of the word *Theotokos* and acknowledged the unity of Christ. He then proceeds, at great length, to show by extracts from Scripture⁸ that Christ is God, Life-giver, and Propitiation.

¹ Nest. *ad Cyrillum*, II, § 4.

² Cyril, *Op.* ix. 1-180 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 1133-1420); *Conc. Eph.* I, cc. iii-v, (Mansi, iv. 618-884); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 340-2; Fleury, xxv. xi; Bardenhewer, 363.

³ *De recta fide ad Theod. Imp.*, § 6 (*Op.* ix. 4; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1141 B). There is a summary review of these types of error in this section. He then goes on to deal with each in greater detail, coming to Apollinarianism in §§ 16 sqq., and to Nestorianism in §§ 25 sqq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 36 (*Op.* ix. 32 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1186 C, D), arguing from 'This is my beloved Son' (Matt. xvii. 5)—not 'In him is my beloved Son'.

⁵ *Sermo*, clxxiv, § 7 (*Op.* v. 834; *P. L.* xxxviii. 943 sq.).

⁶ *De recta fide ad Theod. Imp.*, § 38 (*Op.* ix. 35; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1189 B).

⁷ *De recta fide ad reginas*, I, §§ 9 sqq. (*Op.* ix. 47 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1209 sqq.).

⁸ These are appended after § 13 (*Op.* ix. 55-127; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1221-1336).

In a third memorial to Pulcheria and Eudocia, the elder sister and the wife of Theodosius, he goes over much the same ground ¹; but with the aim of explaining passages relied on by the Nestorian party. The treatise is therefore of value as a museum of their stock-texts ²; and Cyril does not forget to draw attention to a point, often insisted on by modern theologians, ³ that argument based upon proof-texts is of less cogency than reasoning from the indirect bearings of Scripture.

But in thus seeking to neutralize, in the minds of the Imperial family, any impression that Nestorius may have created in his favour, Cyril showed a want of tact. He forgot that, by addresses to the Imperial ladies, he was stirring up the jealousies of the August household. Pulcheria was strongly orthodox; and Theodosius was very conscious that she was 'the better man of the two'.

¹ As he says, *De recta fide ad reginas*, ii, § 4 (*Op.* ix. 131; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1341).

² From § 5 onwards.

³ e. g. H. P. Liddon, *The Divinity of our Lord*, 328, 354; R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*, 20 sqq.

CHAPTER XII

THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, 431

CYRIL would now feel that he had lost rather than gained by addressing himself to the Imperial princesses.

§ 1. He was therefore glad to welcome a fresh ally in Caelestine,¹ bishop of Rome 422–†32, who at this stage intervened in the dispute. Caelestine was of Roman birth—the son of Priscus.² In early life he had visited Milan during the episcopate of St. Ambrose³; had been deacon to Innocent I; and, *c.* 417, a correspondent of Augustine.⁴ All this points to an experience of ecclesiastical administration which made of Caelestine, as of other clergy born and trained in the Church of Rome, Popes distinguished for wisdom rather than for learning. Caelestine had been wise enough, in 426, not to press the claims of his see upon reluctant Africa; though he exerted a little more pressure, 424, in behalf of his rights in Eastern Illyricum,⁵ and dealt out a mixture of disdain and common sense, in 428, to some bishops of Southern Gaul.⁶ But he was discerning enough in doctrine too. He banished Caelestius from Italy, 424. He had a hand in sending Germanus and Lupus, 429, to clear Pelagianism out of Britain; and he managed to give the cold shoulder to the semi-Pelagians without committing himself, as Prosper hoped, to Augustinianism⁷ in 431.

§ 2. So skilful a ruler was not likely to lose his head when, early in 429, the peace of the Roman church was disturbed by the circulation in Rome of the sermons of Nestorius. The Pope wrote at once to Cyril, informed him of their arrival, and asked him if they really emanated from Nestorius. Cyril purposely delayed his reply; but, meanwhile, letters began to reach Caelestine from Nestorius himself. They only served to confirm the impression

¹ See s.v. 'Caelestine', by W. Bright, in *D. C. B.* i. 584–8.

² *Liber Pont.*, *ap. P. L.* l. 407.

³ *Ep.* x (*P. L.* l. 457).

⁴ *Aug. Epp.* cxcii, ccix (*Op.* ii. 710, 777–80; *P. L.* xxxiii. 868–9, 953–7).

⁵ Caelestine, *Ep.* iii (*P. L.* l. 427–9); Jaffé, No. 366.

⁶ *Ep.* iv (*P. L.* l. 429–36); Jaffé, No. 369.

⁷ *Ep.* xxi (*P. L.* l. 528–37); Jaffé, No. 381.

made by the sermons. The first is a letter¹ to which allusion has already been made. It came about Easter, 429; and Nestorius, § 1, professing that he wanted information from Caelestine about the Pelagian refugees now at Constantinople, went on, § 2, to assure him that he too had his troubles with false teachers. My opponents, he says, are Apollinarians. 'They are not afraid, § 3, to call the Virgin *Theotokos*, though the Creed only says that "our Lord Jesus Christ was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary", not to mention the Scriptures which everywhere call her the mother of Christ and not of God the Word. The term is only tolerable if it means that the Temple of the Word, which is inseparable from Him, was taken from her.' The bearer of the letter was a nobleman named Antiochus, who also took with him some writings of Nestorius on the Incarnation subscribed with the author's own hand.² Caelestine received him; but, before returning an answer, he would make sure of his ground. He caused all the productions of Nestorius—sermons, letter, and treatise—that had reached Rome to be translated into Latin; and, through Leo, his archdeacon,³ he called in Cassian, 360–†435, who, through long residence in Constantinople knew Greek as well as Latin, to restate the doctrines in question. Cassian responded with seven books, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorianos*,⁴ 430–1. In the first, he observes, as did his opponent Prosper,⁵ that Pelagianism naturally issues in Nestorianism. 'Believing that man by his own strength may be without sin, they judge the same of Jesus Christ, saying that He was a mere man but that He made so good a use of His free-will that He avoided all sin; that He came into the world only to set an example of good works; that He became Christ after His baptism, and God after His resurrection.'⁶ But Cassian here puts down to Nestorius what is true only of Leporius.⁷ The former expressly taught that the Divine Word was united to man from the womb of Mary; and it is only the mode of this union that was in question between Nestorius and Catholics. He was not, like Leporius, a Samosatene. In the second and third books,

¹ Nest. *ad Caelestinum*, I = *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xvi (Mansi, iv. 1021–3); Caelestine, *Ep.* vi (*P. L.* l. 438–41); Loofs, 165 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. vii.

² Mansi, iv. 1024 D.

³ Cassian, *De Inc.*, Praef. ad Leonem (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 9–12).

⁴ Cassian, *Op.* ii (*P. L.* l. 9–272); tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* xi. 551 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xiii; Bardenhewer, 517.

⁵ Prosper, *Epitaphium N. et P. haer.* (*Op.* 197–9; *P. L.* li. 153 sq.).

⁶ Cassian, *De Inc.* i, § 3 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 20 sqq.); Fleury, iii. 24, note o.

⁷ *Ibid.* i, § 4 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 23 sq.).

Cassian shows that, as Christ is God and man, Mary must be called the Mother of God and not only the Mother of Christ.¹ The fourth is taken up with proving from Scripture the unity of Christ²: which, in the fifth, is shown to be not a moral, but a real union. In the sixth he discusses the evidence of the Creed used at Antioch into which Nestorius had been baptized³; and, in the last, the evidence of the Fathers,⁴ particularly of his master, St. Chrysostom, the great light of the school of Antioch in which Nestorius had been reared. The work was published before the Council of Ephesus deposed Nestorius; for he is treated throughout as bishop of Constantinople. But if Caelestine was waiting to answer the inquiries of Nestorius, till Cassian had thus, so to speak, reported on his case, it is no matter for surprise that Nestorius grew impatient. A second, and yet a third, letter he dispatched to the Pope. The former⁵ he sent by Valerius, an Imperial chamberlain. 'I have written several times', he says, § 1, 'to your Holiness about Julian and his fellow-exiles: but not a word in reply have I received as yet.' I keep putting them off, day after day, in the hope, as I tell them, of hearing from you. They are a great bore. But, § 2, so are the others I spoke of.' He means the Catholics. He dubs them Apollinarians; but, in describing their doctrine, expressly admits, for his own part, that the natures of Godhead and manhood are united together in one Person. The admission, however, was delusive, as Vincent of Lerins points out.⁶ The third letter,⁷ of November 430, did not reach the Pope till much had happened in the interval.

§ 3. Meanwhile, news arrived from the other side; for, about April 430, Cyril replied to the inquiries of Caelestine.⁸ He says,

¹ Cassian, *De Inc.* ii, § 2 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 51 sqq.).

² Ibid. iv, § 6 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 81 sqq.).

³ Ibid. vi, § 3 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 140 sqq.). The Creed was the Creed of Nicaea, as adopted at the synod of Antioch, Oct. 363: see the synodal letter to Jovian in *Socr. H. E.* iii. xxv, §§ 10-18.

⁴ Hilary, vii, § 24, Ambrose, § 25, Jerome, § 26, Rufinus and Augustine, § 27, Greg. Naz., § 28, Ath., § 29, Chrysostom, §§ 30-1 (*Op.* ii; *P. L.* l. 250-70).

⁵ Nest. *ad Caelest.* ii = Caelestine, *Ep.* vii (*P. L.* l. 442-4); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xvii (Mansi, iv. 1023 sq.); Loofs, 169 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xiv.

⁶ Vincent, *Comm.*, § 12 (*P. L.* l. 655).

⁷ Nest. *ad Caelest.* *Ep.* iii = Caelestine, *Ep.* xv (*P. L.* l. 499-501); Marius M. (*P. L.* l. xlviii. 841 sq.); Mansi, v. 725; Loofs, 181 sq.; Fleury, xxv. xxviii.

⁸ Cyril, *Ep.* xi (*Op.* x. 36-40; *P. L.* lxxvii. 79-86); *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xiv (Mansi, iv. 1011-18); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 345; Fleury, xxv. xii; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 250.

§§ 1, 2, he had kept silence on purpose¹; but, § 3, would now tell the whole story, beginning with the support which Nestorius gave to Dorotheus; his own, § 4, letter to the monks and his two letters to Nestorius—both to no purpose. The Eastern Empire, § 5, is on our side, and particularly the bishops of Macedonia. But, § 6, we have not been able to bring him to a better mind. We have been unwilling, § 7, to break off communion with him, until we had laid the whole story before you and taken your opinion. Be good enough, therefore, to let me know whether we ought still to communicate with him, or to tell him that, if he persists in his teaching, he will be abandoned by everybody. It would be well, if I may suggest it, to let your wishes be made known in writing to the bishops of Macedonia as well as those of ‘The East’. That your Holiness, § 9, may be the better informed both as to the opinions of Nestorius and as to those of the Fathers, I have the honour to send you books—including apparently his *Adv. Nestorii blasphemias Libri V*,² in answer to the sermons preached by Nestorius against Proclus—with passages marked; and I have had them translated into Latin for your convenience—as well, I mean, as we could do it in Alexandria. I also enclose my own letters; and my messenger, Posidonius, will bring you, besides all these documents, a statement of the doctrine of Nestorius and an account of his deposition of the priest Philip.³ With this *dossier* of the case in his possession, Posidonius departed; but also with instructions from his master not to exhibit its contents to Caelestine, until he was satisfied that the Pope had also been approached from the other side.⁴

Cyril, still anxious for adherents, wrote next to ‘The East’: and sought the sympathies of Acacius,⁵ bishop of Beroea (now Aleppo) 379–†437. He had been fifty years a bishop, and had been consecrated by Eusebius of Samosata, the contemporary of St. Basil. He had taken part with Theophilus against Chrysostom; and Cyril may have counted on his uncle’s supporter coming to his

¹ He probably has in mind the tradition of Alexandria in favour of reference to Rome, which is illustrated by the case of Dionysius of Alexandria being brought to the notice of Dionysius of Rome, and of Athanasius to Pope Julius. But over Chrysostom, Alexandria had been at variance with Rome; and the precedent had been conveniently forgotten, till it suited Cyril to revive it.

² Cyril, *Op.* x. 9–143 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 9–248); tr. *L. F.* xlvii; Bardenhewer, 363.

³ *Commonitorium* appended to Cyril, *Ep.* xi (*Op.* x. 40; *P. G.* lxxvii. 85–90).

⁴ *Conc. Eph.* Actio I, *ad init.* (Mansi, iv. 1129 A, B).

⁵ *Ep.* xiv (*Op.* x. 43; *P. G.* lxxvii. 97); *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxii (Mansi, iv. 1053–5); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 347; Fleury, xxv. xii.

aid almost as a matter of course. But Acacius disappointed him. He had mellowed with age, or wished to stand well with John of Antioch, 428–†441, the new patriarch of 'The East'. 'A phrase', wrote Acacius,¹ 'ought not to set us by the ears.' Paulinus of Antioch, for instance, would not have anything to do with the 'Three Hypostases' of us Greeks; but he did not really differ from us in belief. Probably it is so with the phraseology of Nestorius. At any rate, clerics and laymen, in considerable numbers, have come from Constantinople to these parts, and have assured us that he has said nothing inconsistent with the teaching of the Apostles or with the Nicene Creed. I read your book to John, our new patriarch. He quite agrees with us old men, and is already much thought of everywhere in 'The East'. He begs you to proceed with prudence.

It was the first sign of the rift, shortly to open between Cyril and the Orientals: they wished to prevent the controversy going further. But when Posidonius arrived in Rome, the time had gone by for hushing it up. He found that Nestorius had already set out his case to Caelestine, and therefore presented the documents he carried from Cyril. The Pope was in possession, at last, of information from both sides; and prompted, it may be, by his arch-deacon Leo, who could see the point of a theological question where perhaps Caelestine did not, he determined not simply to declare for Cyril but to make Cyril his agent in the recovery of Nestorius, if it were still possible. No General Council was yet in view—still less, a condemnation; but the attempt to secure his submission was made in the Councils of Rome and Alexandria, August–November 430.

§ 4. The Council of Rome² met in August 430; and we still possess a fragment of the speech in which Caelestine, after comparing the documents which he had received from Constantinople and Alexandria, gave his opinion. 'I remember', said he, 'that Ambrose of blessed memory taught all the people to sing in concert on Christmas Day:

Veni, Redemptor gentium,
Ostende partum Virginis,
Miretur omne saeculum,
Talis decet partus Deum.

¹ *Ep. xv* (*Op. x.* 46–65; *P. G. lxxvii.* 99–102); *Conc. Eph. i.* c. xxiii (Mansi, iv. 1055–8).

² Mansi, iv. 545–52; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 260–4 (E. Tr. iii. 25); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 350 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xiv; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 250.

How well does this agree with our brother Cyril's language, when he calls Mary "Mother of God"; and with our belief who say that He, whom the Virgin, by the aid of Omnipotence brought forth, was Very God.'¹ The Pope then went on to cite Hilary² and Damasus³—he appeals to Latin Fathers only—with the result that Nestorius was condemned, and Cyril entrusted with carrying the sentence into execution. To this effect the Pope, in the name of the Council, wrote in all, seven letters,⁴ under date 11 August 430—to Cyril, to Nestorius, to the Clergy and People of Constantinople and, in common terms, to the other chief prelates of the Eastern Empire: John, of Antioch; Juvenal, of Jerusalem, 428–†38; Rufus, of Thessalonica, 410–†31, the papal Vicar of Eastern Illyricum, and one of his suffragans, Flavian of Philippi. We must now look at their contents.

In *Tristitiae nostrae*,⁵ addressed to Cyril, Caelestine, § 1, commends his vigilance; and, § 2, professes himself in entire agreement with him. We ought to do what we can, § 3, to reclaim Nestorius; but, if he will not yield, then you, Cyril, § 4, 'the authority of our See having been combined with yours, will act authoritatively in our stead, and will carry out this sentence with due severity: that is, that unless within ten days after receiving our admonition, Nestorius anathematizes his heterodox doctrine in writing and positively declares that he holds that faith with regard to the Nativity of Christ our God, which both the Roman church and the church of your Holiness and all Christians in general hold, your Holiness is to provide for the church in Constantinople, and he is to understand that he is in every way separate from our body.' Cyril, in a word, is to act as his brother patriarch's proxy: they hoped to settle the matter between them; and the project of a General Council was not yet afoot. So far then is it from being the case that, in this letter, the Pope is appointing Cyril to preside, as his legate, at the Council of Ephesus.⁶

¹ *Sermo*, § 1, appended to Caelestine, *Ep.* ix (*P. L.* l. 457 sq.).

² *Ibid.*, § 2 (457 B, c), citing from Hilary, *Ad Const.* i (see *Op.* i. Praef., § 190; *P. L.* x. 92).

³ *Ibid.*, § 3, citing from Damasus, *Ep.* iv, § 6 (*P. L.* xiii. 359 A).

⁴ Caelestine, *Epp.* xi–xiv (*P. L.* l. 459–500); Mansi, iv. 1017, 1026–50; Jaffé, Nos. 372–5.

⁵ *Ep.* xi; *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xv (Mansi, iv. 1017); Fleury, xxv. xiv.

⁶ Caelestine authorized Cyril to act as his proxy for a specific purpose, viz. to give Nestorius notice to quit after ten days. But, by the time that the Council met at Ephesus, that 'commission, so to call it, had been exhausted', W. Bright, *Age of the Fathers*, ii. 311, with which agree E. Denny, *Papalism*, § 365; L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 349, n. 1.

Aliquantis diebus ¹ Caelestine sent, by the same post, to Nestorius. It is lengthy and verbose. He regrets, § 2, that he has been deceived in the good opinion he had conceived of him ; but, after reading the letters and the books he had sent by Antiochus, he is bound to observe that they diverge from the Catholic Faith. As to those Pelagians, § 8, about whom you ask my advice as if you knew nothing of what had passed, they were justly condemned. To judge by your sermons, you hold the doctrine of Original Sin. How then can you tolerate near your person those who deny it ? When opposite parties form a coalition, there is generally room for suspicion : and it is absurd for you to make inquiries here, when Atticus your predecessor sent us Acts made against them. Sisinnius never inquired of us : he knew well enough : and so too, I am sure, does your Holiness. It is a case, § 9, of ‘ Physician, heal thyself ’. I warn you, therefore, § 10, that, if you persist in your stubbornness of perverse disputation and do not preach the things which Cyril our brother preaches, the church of Constantinople (to which I am writing in this sense) and all Christians are to regard you as separate from the College of Bishops, with whom you cannot hold communion. You are also, § 11, to understand that if you do not preach concerning Christ our God the things which the Roman, the Alexandrian, and the whole Catholic Church holds—nay, which the church of Constantinople has hitherto held—and if you do not condemn, publicly and in writing, your novel doctrines within ten days from the receipt of this admonition, you will be cast out from the communion of the Catholic Church. At our request the deacon Posidonius will take this sentence to the bishop of Alexandria, and he will act as our proxy.

In *Ad eos qui faciunt* ² Caelestine next addressed the clergy and people of the Capital. As St. Paul had care, he begins, § 1, of all the churches, so have I a fatherly solicitude for you. Nestorius, in denying God’s birth of the Virgin, is endangering the Divinity of her Son. What a pitiful contrast, § 2, to your great bishop, John—to Atticus and to Sisinnius. You must endure, § 7, manfully : and he bids them remember the example of Athanasius, in a summary of his career which deserves to be noted, as proof of the impression which Athanasius had made on Rome and the West. Cyril, § 8, to whom this letter is to go, in the first instance by Posidonius, will

¹ *Ep.* xiii ; *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xviii (Mansi, iv. 1025–36) ; Fleury, xxv. xiv.

² *Ep.* xiv ; *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xix (Mansi, iv. 1035–46).

act in our stead ; and, § 9, he will carry out the sentence here appended. The same sentence is communicated in *Optaremus*¹ to John, and in copies of it to Juvenal, Rufus, and his suffragan, Flavian of Philippi.

Posidonius returned to Alexandria with the papal letters in which, of course, Caelestine uses the language then customary about the dignity and pre-eminence of his see ; but, if he had meant to act on the principles of Vaticanism, he would not have taken the trouble to secure the assent of Alexandria and Antioch, and to get them to act with him. Cyril, in forwarding Caelestine's communications to John and to Juvenal, took the opportunity of adding a word to each of them, as from himself. John was a friend of Nestorius, and might need propitiating : for, though in doctrinal sympathy with Cyril, he was suspicious of his affinities with Apollinarianism. Accordingly Cyril sends him² the sentence of the recent Roman synod : let John do what he can in the matter [*sc.* with Nestorius] ; for his part, the writer has made up his mind to act with Caelestine and the Western bishops : he would keep to their communion. To Juvenal,³ he pointed out that the question at stake touched the Christian's hope ; if Mary is not the Mother of God, then no God is Emmanuel on whom our hope of salvation is set. And he went on to say that recourse will have to be had to the Emperor, to deliver the cause of religion from this false pastor. How Juvenal took it we do not know ; but John, for all his friendship for Nestorius, rallied to the appeal of Caelestine and Cyril at once. Enclosing both their letters, he wrote to Nestorius⁴ and begged him, § 2, to read them dispassionately and to take advice. ' Ten days ! ' he said, § 3, ' An hour or two is enough ! There is ample precedent for the term *Theotokos*. I am told on all sides that your sentiments are those of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. Then why scruple the term ? The West, Egypt, and, in all probability, Macedonia too, have resolved to separate from that union which terminated the schism at Antioch in the days of my predecessor Alexander. I have only to add, § 4, that I am writing with the approval of Theodoret and other mutual friends of ours.'

¹ *Ep.* xii ; *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xx (Mansi, iv. 1047-50).

² Cyril, *Ep.* xiii (*Op.* x. 42-4 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 93-8) ; *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xxi (Mansi, iv. 1050 sq.) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 353 ; Fleury, xxv. xix.

³ *Ep.* xvi. (*Op.* x. 65-7 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 103-6) ; *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xxiv (Mansi, iv. 1057-60) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 353 ; Fleury, xxv. xix.

⁴ *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xxv (Mansi, iv. 1061-8) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 354 ; Fleury, xxv. xx.

Thus John placed himself unreservedly on the side of Cyril ; but the only effect was to stiffen the resolution of Nestorius. He replied¹ courteously but evasively : said that he was no heretic, and that, so far from dividing the Church, it was with the very purpose of preserving its unity that he had expressed a distaste both for ' Mother of God ' and ' Mother of man ', and a preference for ' Mother of Christ ' who was both God and man. Do not therefore disquiet yourself, my dear John. We shall meet shortly in a Council that, I hope, is to be convened and will straighten things out. The Egyptian then will find his level. It is evident that Nestorius had not been dislodged from the Imperial favour : while for the first time it is now clear that the General Council was being asked for from his side.

§ 5. But Cyril, satisfied that he might now look to ' The East ' for support, stepped in first, and, at the Council of Alexandria,² November 430, proceeded to put into execution the commission of Caelestine. It was probably the synod usually held in the autumn, and consisting of all the bishops of the ' Diocese ' of Egypt ; and, in their Synodical Epistle, *Cum Salvator*,³ Cyril sent his third and last admonition to Nestorius. ' All other considerations ', says the Synod, § 1, ' must be put aside when Christ and his truth are in question. We have therefore to transmit to you, § 2, the letter of Caelestine and the Roman Council and to inform you that if, within ten days from the receipt of this communication of ours, you do not renounce your errors, we can have no further communion with you, but only with those whom you have excommunicated. It will not be sufficient for you to confess the Nicene Faith in words, for you put a forced interpretation on it. You must declare in writing and on oath that you anathematize your impious tenets, and believe what we believe,' and by ' we ' is meant ' all bishops and doctors of East and West '.⁴ The Synod, § 3, then quotes the Creed of Nicaea, and proceeds to a statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation as therein involved, viz. that the only-begotten

¹ *Synodicon*, c. iii (Mansi, v. 753 sq., or Thdt. *Op.* v. 618 sq. ; *P. G.* lxxxiv. 576 sq.) ; Loofs, 183-6 ; Tillemont, *Mém.* 356 ; Fleury, xxv. xx.

² Mansi, iv. 551-2 ; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 264-8 (E. Tr. iii. 28-31) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 356 ; Fleury, xxv. xxi ; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 251.

³ *Ep.* xviii. (*Op.* x. 67-77 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 105-22) ; *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxvi (Mansi, iv. 1067-84) ; text, notes, and tr. in Bindley, *Oec. Doc.*

⁴ Note that ' all bishops and doctors ', not ' all Christians ', are the authority : an interesting comment on what Vincent in ' *ubique, semper et ab omnibus* ' means by ' *omnibus* ' : see above, iii. 155, and B. J. Kidd, *How can I be sure that I am a Catholic ?* 15.

Son of God, God of God, was made man, being really born of the Virgin, for He assumed flesh from her. This condescension, or *κένωσις*, as Cyril habitually terms it, is not to be thought of as involving any abandonment of His Godhead : for throughout He remained after the Incarnation what He was before, i. e. very God ; nor as involving any change of flesh into Godhead or of Godhead into flesh—where Cyril disclaims the Apollinarianism so freely attributed to him.¹ He then goes on, § 4, to set aside terms and conceptions inadequate to express the Unity of Person. The Christ we worship is one, not man and God conjoined by a union of merit ; nor a mere man indwelt by God, as were the Saints ; nor, § 5, a mere man connected with the Word by a so-called union of dignity (which would be no real union), nor by juxtaposition, nor by such a participation as is contingent only or non-essential. Nay, we deprecate that term ‘ connexion ’ (*συνάφεια*) altogether, as inadequate to express the union (*ένωσις*) whereby, § 6, the Word Himself, being truly God, became for us truly man. We have not, in short, two Christs but one Christ : impassible in His own original or divine Nature (*φύσις*), but passible in that flesh which He took for His own. And this is clear from, § 7, the Unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist. Therein we partake of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. But we look upon it not as ordinary flesh nor as the flesh of a holy man conjoined with, or inhabited by, the Word ; but as the Flesh which belongs to God the Word and is therefore life-giving. It is life-giving just because He, being life as God, in becoming one with the flesh He assumed, rendered it life-giving ; and it would not be life-giving unless it were thus really His.¹ As to those sayings of His in the Gospels, § 8, which are cited against this unity of Person, they do but prove His real manhood ; and we who acknowledge it find no difficulty in His having spoken as if it were real. He became, § 9, our High Priest in His manhood, but this does not mean that He was a man who

¹ Document No. 194 ; and for other instances of the argument from the Eucharist to the Incarnation, see Thdt. *Dial.* ii (*Op.* iv. 126 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 168 B, C) ; Leo, *Ep.* lix, § 2 (*Op.* i. 977 ; *P. L.* liv. 868 A, B) ; *Sermo*, xci, § 3 (*Op.* i. 356 sq. ; *P. L.* liv. 452 B) ; Gelasius, *De duabus naturis*, § 14, *ap. A. Thiel, Epist. Rom. Pont.* [A. D. 461–523] 541 sq., or M. J. Routh, *Script. eccl. opusc.* ii. 139, and the notes in J. Pearson, *On the Creed*, 290, n. 21 (Oxford, 1877) ; W. Bright, *Later Treatises of St. Ath.* 208, note p ; Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 138 ; C. Gore, *Dissertations*, 274 sqq. In these cases the argument is anti-Monophysite, as with Cyril, anti-Nestorian. In any case it is invalid unless there be a Real Presence in the Sacrament, i. e. on any Receptionist, Virtualist, or Zwinglian doctrine of the Presence—or absence.

needed propitiation ; for, § 10, He possessed, and used and sent forth the Spirit as His own in virtue of His Godhead ; and, § 11, united the manhood personally to Himself through a woman who is rightly called *Theotokos* because, though she could not be parent of the Word as the Word, she nevertheless gave birth to the flesh which He took and therein to Him who had made it His own.

With this vindication of the test word in the controversy, the Synodal Letter ends ; but, in order to give precision to the things which Nestorius was to anathematize, its authors subjoined Twelve Anathemas¹ to which he was to assent as well. Their addition was a blunder. If conciliation was still the purpose of the Council, the anathemas were a mistake for the immediate purpose. Enough if Nestorius were to accept the crucial word *Theotokos*, with which the Synodal Letter concluded : why ask him to go further and provocatively demand that he should repudiate every alleged phase of his theory in detail ? But it was a blunder which long afterwards hampered the efforts of Cyril. Some of the anathematisms were open to criticism as one-sided, e.g. the third² and the last³ ; one of them put the contested term *Theotokos* aggressively to the front, viz. the first, whereas the Synod had led up to it in argument and kept it to the last ; all of them, though each did but summarize some portion of the letter,⁴ might be torn from their context, and treated as if they covered the whole of Cyrilline theology. And this, indeed, is what happened. For Nestorius used them to make a breach between Cyril and John, who was shocked at their Apollinarianism.⁵ So they served but to defeat the project they were intended to promote.⁶

On Sunday, 7 December⁷ 430, letter and anathematisms were

¹ Cyril, *Op.* x. 76 sq. (*P. G.* lxxvii. 119–22) ; *Conc. Eph.* i. c. xxvi (Mansi, iv. 1081–4) ; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 357 ; Fleury, xxv. xxii ; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 268–78 (*E. Tr.* iii. 31–3) ; W. Bright, *Later Treatises*, 158 sqq.

² *Ἐνωσις φυσική* is the crux. If *φύσις* = nature, then this phrase is monophysite, and might be so taken, if left without further explanation. But by *φυσική* Cyril meant (a) ‘personal’—*ἔνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν* was an equivalent phrase of his—and (b) ‘real’ as opposed to ‘titular’, W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 160.

³ *Τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον παθόντα σαρκί* might be taken to mean that the Word was passible.

⁴ For the relation, in detail, see W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 157, note y.

⁵ See his letters to Theodosius II and to Cyril, *Synodicon*, xvii, lxxx (Mansi, v. 782 c, 857 b) ; W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 158, note a.

⁶ For the authority subsequently accorded to them, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 358–61 ; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 252, n. 1 ; W. Bright, *Hist. Ch. A. D.* 313–451, 333 nn.

⁷ For this date, Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 253, n. 2.

delivered to Nestorius, after the celebration of the Liturgy. Four Egyptian bishops had brought them. They also presented the letter of Caelestine¹; and they carried letters from Cyril to the clergy and people of Constantinople,² and to its abbots and monasteries.³ 'We have not,' he writes, 'had recourse to excommunication till the very last moment. But hope is now all but gone. Should your bishop refuse to listen, then your duty will be to have no intercourse with him. You are assured, in that case, of the communion of Rome and Alexandria; as are all those who have already been excommunicated by him.'

§ 6. The four bishops did not arrive at Constantinople till Friday,⁴ 5 December 430; and then they found that, by the mandate of the Emperor, there had been summoned, a fortnight previously, a General Council to meet at Ephesus⁵ by Pentecost, 431. Both parties had urged it: the Catholics, as is clear from the petition of Basil and his monks who had been roughly handled by Nestorius⁶; and Nestorius himself, as we are told in his third letter to Caelestine.⁷ He hoped to be able to influence it by the support of the Court and his friends in 'The East', and so obtain from it a condemnation of Cyril on the charges made against him by the Egyptian refugees.

§ 7. The citation⁸ is dated 19 November 430. It ran in the name of the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III, and was addressed to Metropolitans. They were to repair to Ephesus by Pentecost, and bring with them a sufficient number of their suffragans: meanwhile, no innovations were to be introduced. The letter is a dignified specimen of the point of view of Christian Caesarism, 'the welfare of our Empire', according to Theodosius, 'being bound up with the worship of God'. In tone, it may remind us of 'His Majesty's Declaration'. But the hand of Nestorius is traceable in it. To forbid innovations till the Council

¹ *Conc. Eph.* Actio I (Mansi, iv. 1180 B, c).

² *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxvii (Mansi, iv. 1093-6); Cyril *Ep.* xviii (*Op.* x. 78 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 123-6).

³ *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxviii (Mansi, iv. 1097-8); Cyril, *Ep.* xix (*Op.* x. 80 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 125-8).

⁴ Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 253.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 1123 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 287-377 (E. Tr. iii. 40-114); Tillemont, xiv. 362 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xxiii-lix; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 254 sqq.

⁶ *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxx, §§ 3, 4 (Mansi, iv. 1105).

⁷ Marius Merc. *Op.* ii. 80 (*P. L.* xlvi. 841); Loofs, 181; Fleury, xxv. xxviii. Possibly this letter was enclosed along with the Imperial citation.

⁸ *Conc. Eph.* I, c. xxxii (Mansi, iv. 1111-16); Fleury, xxv. xxiii.

met was to suspend the proceedings of Caelestine and Cyril : while his hand is also traceable in the private letter of remonstrance which the Emperor enclosed to Cyril¹ along with the formal citation. He charges Cyril with being the author of all the troubles ; and then proceeds to reprimand him for ' having written in one sense to Us and our most Pious Consort, the Empress Eudocia, and in quite another to our August Sister, Pulcheria—as if a Princess disagreed with our Imperial Majesty, or could ' !² It was a ' peevish ' ³ letter, but it illustrates the Emperor's character. He was jealous of the ascendancy of his sister ; and the policy of Nestorius had so far successfully played, in his own interest and to the disadvantage of Cyril, on that jealousy. But the Emperor concludes that Cyril has his forgiveness : only he is to hasten to the Council, and strive with it to restore peace to the Church.⁴ A special missive was also sent to invite the presence of Augustine, in deference to his great reputation ; but the courier arrived with it at Carthage, toward Easter, 431, only to learn that, six months before, the great Doctor of the West had passed away.⁵

Nestorius and Cyril next began to collect allies.

§ 8. Nestorius, after having received the ultimatum of Rome and Alexandria, for some days kept to his palace. But on Saturday, 13 December 430, he preached.⁶ Beginning, § 1, with a commendation of charity, he dissociated himself, § 2, from Paul of Samosata, and, § 3, confessed ' one Christ '. Cyril, he said, § 4, had resorted to bribery ; and, § 5, was imitating former bishops of Alexandria in their treatment of Flavian, Meletius, and John. Jealousy, he thus hinted, § 7, was at the bottom of the dispute. But he would make a concession : let Cyril condemn the heretical sense of *Theotokos*, i.e. as involving a mixture of natures, and he would accept it in its sound sense. But, § 10, better *Christotokos*. Enough, § 29, of Egyptian contentiousness : to balance both sides of the truth, § 32, let them not stand out for *Theotokos* only, but let them

¹ *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xxxi (Mansi, iv. 1109–12) ; Fleury, xxv. xxiii.

² Mansi, iv. 1109 D, E.

³ Newman's note to Fleury, iii. 42, note n.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1112 c.

⁵ Capreolus, Abp. of Carthage 430–†5, to the Synod, *Conc. Eph.* Actio i, c. 2 (Mansi, iv. 1207 E) ; Fleury, xxv. xli.

⁶ *Sermo*, xii ; M. M. ii. 84 sqq. (*P. L.* xlvi. 848–62) ; Loofs, 298–313 ; Fleury, xxv. xxix. Garnier says of this sermon, ' there is none of his discourses from which we can learn so much of the nature of N.'s views as from this ', M. M. ii. 85 (*P. L.* xlvi. 847, note a).

call Mary *Anthropotokos* as well. Next day, Sunday, 14 December 430, in a shorter sermon,¹ he preached again, by request and to a crowded congregation. 'I am weary,' he said, § 2, 'and you are uncomfortable, because you are standing there so tightly packed. "Christ" is the word, § 4, that best represents both aspects of the truth together. *Theotokos* and *Anthropotokos*, §§ 6-7, are each required to balance the other.' Loud applause greeted the archbishop; and his next step was to send the two sermons to John of Antioch, with Cyril's anathemas and the reply already mentioned to John's letter of advice, in order to detach him, if possible, from Cyril and Caelestinus. John received these documents with satisfaction; and was as highly dissatisfied with the anathemas of Cyril. He wrote to Firmus, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 431-†8, saying that he doubted whether they could be Cyril's: at any rate, they were Apollinarian, and Firmus would do well to examine them and condemn them in synod.² Nestorius, however, was in no uncertainty as to their authorship, and flung at their author twelve counter-anathematisms.³ The first makes it clear that his admission of the term *Theotokos* was illusory; for it condemns the statement that Emmanuel should be called true God rather than God with us, and that Mary should be called Mother of God the Word rather than Mother of Emmanuel.⁴ Others were confused⁵; and others betrayed his incurable habit of regarding the Word and the man assumed by him as separate persons.⁶ They did no good to his cause, and were immediately exposed by Marius Mercator, then at Constantinople, in his *Nestorii blasphemiarum capitula*,⁷ early in 431. Nestorius, he says, makes much of the silence of the Council of Nicaea in regard to the word *Theotokos*; but it is not silent as to the thing in question under cover of the dispute about that word; for its Creed unequivocally identifies Jesus with the consubstantial and only-begotten Son of God—and this is the heart of the matter.⁸

¹ *Sermo*, xiii; M. M. ii. 93 sqq. (*P. L.* xlvi. 862-4); Loofs, 314 sqq.

² *Synodicon*, c. iv (Mansi, v. 756 sq.; or Thdt. *Op.* v. 622 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxiv. 579-81).

³ Preserved in the version of M. M. *Op.* ii. 116 sqq. (*P. L.* xlvi. 909 sqq.); Loofs, 211-17.

⁴ Loofs, 212.

⁵ e. g. No. 8; ib. 215.

⁶ e. g. No. 3; ib. 213.

⁷ M. M. *Op.* ii. 115-26 (*P. L.* xlvi. 909-32); Bardenhewer, 509.

⁸ M. M. *Appendix ad contradictionem xii anath. Nest.*, §§ 5, 6 (*Op.* ii. 127; *P. L.* xlvi. 925).

§ 9. But the credit which Nestorius thus lost at home he gained further afield. For John, meanwhile, had procured the assistance of two Syrian teachers, who, 'though they did not finally forfeit the communion of the Church',¹ found themselves, at this stage, in sympathy with Nestorius.

The one was Andrew, originally a monk of Constantinople, and then bishop of Samosata, 431-4. He attacked the Cyrilline anathematisms in the name of the Orientals.²

The other, and more famous, was Theodoret.³ Born at Antioch, 393, of a pious father and a wealthy and fashionable but religious mother,⁴ he received his early training in the monastic schools of that region. Chrysostom and Theodore were his masters; Nestorius and John his fellow-students; and, in early life, after seven years in the convent of Nicerte,⁵ near Apamea, some seventy-five miles from Antioch, 416-23, he was made bishop of Cyrus, 423-†58. It was a small town in Syria Euphratensis, subject to the metropolitan of Hierapolis, and some two days' journey from Antioch; but there were eight hundred parishes in the diocese,⁶ and ample scope for the energies even of a Theodoret—ascetic, prelate, apologist, missionary, preacher, theologian, exegete, letter-writer, and historian in turn. On the death of his parents Theodoret had distributed his patrimony⁷; and, as bishop, possessed no more than the clothes he wore.⁸ But, with the bounty of many a greater prelate, he spent the revenues of his see in benefactions to his Cathedral city, which he adorned with colonnades, and provided with bridges, baths, and a public water-supply. As missionary he swept his diocese—the wild district known as the Cyrrhestica—clear of heretics: 'eight villages of Marcionites, another full of Eunomians, and another of Arians,' yielded to his persuasion: 'not a tare of heresy was left among us.'⁹ And this, in spite of the fact that Cyrus and its wilds were not much to his taste: for,

¹ Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 254.

² Fragments extant in the reply of Cyril, *Op.* ix. 157-200 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 315-86).

³ Works in *P. G.* lxxx-lxxxv; tr. in *N. and P.-N. F.* iii: see also Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 207-340; Fleury, xxv. xxx; J. H. Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 307-62; Bardenheuer, 370-5.

⁴ Thdt. *Hist. Rel.* ix (*Op.* iii. 1188 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1381); tr. Newman, *Hist. Sk.* ii. 309 sqq.

⁵ Thdt. *Ep.* cxix (*Op.* iv. 1202; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1329 c).

⁶ *Ep.* cxiii (*Op.* iv. 1190; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1316 d). The word *παροικία* is here used in the modern sense of 'parish'.

⁷ Ibid. (*Op.* iv. 1192; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1317 c).

⁸ *Ep.* lxxxi (*Op.* iv. 1140 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1261).

⁹ Ibid.

as preacher,¹ he was in request, and thoroughly enjoyed his yearly preaching-visit to Antioch. There he was welcomed by congenial colleagues, and cheered to the echo by cultivated audiences whom he could quote, in countless testimony, to the orthodoxy of his teaching. For these visits went on for 'six years under bishop Theodotus, 421-†8; thirteen in the time of bishop John, 428-†41, of blessed memory, who was so delighted at my discourses that he would start up [from his throne] and clap his hands again and again; and this, 447, is the seventh year I have been preaching under his nephew, Domnus',² 441-†9. The preaching of Theodoret was sometimes in the character of apologist; for the ten discourses *De Providentia*³ were probably delivered in Antioch about 432, and are a defence of Theism against Deism. Five years previously he had set out in this rôle with his *Graecarum affectionum curatio*,⁴ 427, i.e. 'Healing of heathen ailments' or 'Gospel truth by way of Greek philosophy'. Here he deals in Book I with the objection that the Apostles were not men of scientific culture; and, in Books II-XII, discusses the answers given by Christian and pagan respectively to the ultimate questions of philosophy and theology.⁵ As exegete, he wrote both treatises and commentaries. The latter are models of what a commentary should be for their brevity and clearness; and, while Theodoret was no slave to literalism,⁶ he was the ablest exponent of the Antiochene principles of interpretation. 'With him', it has been said, 'the golden age of the Antiochene school closes.'⁷ Nor must his labours in the region of the historian be overlooked. His history of the monks, entitled *Philotheus sive religiosa Historia*,⁸ c. 444, is an account of the celebrated ascetics of the East: including St. Simeon of the Pillar,⁹ Peter who had cured and converted the author's mother, and who used to take him, as a child, on his knees and feed him with bread and raisins,¹⁰ and Macedonius,¹¹

¹ There was a disposition on the part of Theodoret and his party to exalt preaching unduly, very much as with the Puritans in later days: see note by J. H. Newman in his *Fleury*, iii. 137, note p.

² *Ep.* lxxxiii. (*Op.* iv. 1146 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1268 c), and Document No. 223.

³ *Op.* iv. 482-686 (*P. G.* lxxxiii. 555-774).

⁴ *Op.* iv. 687-1040 (*P. G.* lxxxiii. 783-1152).

⁵ For a summary, see his prologue (*Op.* iv. 687-93; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 783-80).

⁶ He thinks allegorism has its place (*Praef. in Pss.*; *Op.* i. 603 [*P. G.* lxxx. 860 c]); and defends the allegorical significance of the *Song of Songs* (*Praef. in Cant.*; *Op.* ii. 2 sq. [*P. G.* lxxxi. 29 sq.]).

⁷ Bardenheuer, 373.

⁸ *Op.* iii. 1099-1319 (*P. G.* lxxxii. 1283-1522).

⁹ *Rel. Hist.*, c. xxvi.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, c. ix.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, c. xiii.

who would, no doubt, tell him the story of how he and his fellow-hermits had saved Antioch from destruction when Theodosius was wroth with the city for insulting the Imperial Statues.¹ There followed the better-known *Historia Ecclesiastica*,² written about 450 : it takes up the story where Eusebius left off and continues it, in five books, to the outbreak of Nestorianism, i. e. it covers the years, 323–428, and is specially of value for events connected with Antioch. Finally, in the *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*,³ written after 451, Theodoret develops the history of heresies from the days of Simon Magus, in four books : the fifth being a *résumé* of the faith of the Church by way of reply. There remain the contributions of the bishop of Cyrus to dogmatic theology ; but they will best appear as we take up the story of his place in the controversy raised by Nestorius. They began at the invitation of John of Antioch, and in company with Andrew of Samosata : for to this date, c. 430, belongs Theodoret's *Refutation* or *Reprehensio duodecim anathematismorum Cyrilli*, preserved in the answer of his antagonist.⁴ The two protagonists in the discussion were at last well matched : for, if Cyril stood pre-eminent as ' a clear-headed constructive theologian ',⁵ Theodoret was ' *facile princeps* among his brethren for . . . learning and . . . oratory '.⁶

Nestorius, in thus gaining over John and his dependents, had delivered a good stroke for his cause by securing in John the ecclesiastical, and in Theodoret the theological, leader of ' The East '. A wedge had thus been driven in between the Orientals and Alexandria.

§ 10. But Cyril, in the meanwhile, was active also. He replied to his critics in turn,⁷ during the early months of 431, and wrote again to Caelesthine.

(1) In answer to Andrew of Samosata, Cyril composed his

¹ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xx, §§ 5–10.

² *Op.* iii. 772–1089 (*P. G.* lxxxii. 881–1280), and ed. T. Gaisford (Oxonii, 1854) ; tr. *N. and P.-N. F.*

³ *Op.* iv. 280–481 (*P. G.* lxxxiii. 335–556).

⁴ Cyril, *Apol. c. Theodoretum* (*Op.* ix. 204–40 ; *P. G.* lxxvi. 391–452).

⁵ J. H. Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 345.

⁶ W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 149 q.v., for a sketch of Cyril and Theodoret as protagonists in the controversy.

⁷ From the criticisms upon Cyril's XII Articles made by Andrew and Theodoret, and from Cyril's replies to them and to Nestorius, we can get a good idea of the theological situation in 431 : see all these documents taken together and discussed in reference to each Anathematism in *ibid.* 158–70.

Apologia contra Orientales.¹ Andrew had not named him, so Cyril mentions no name in reply ; but his method is to set down first his own anathematism, then the criticism of the Orientals, and then his defence. Some of Andrew's objections were captious,² and others misconceived what Cyril meant.³ They were more at one than Andrew would allow.

(2) In the *Apologia contra Theodoretum pro XII capitibus*⁴ which Cyril sent, with a prefatory letter to Euoptius, a bishop who had supplied him with the objections of Theodoret, he mentions his critic's name, but sets down original, criticism, and defence as before. Theodoret, to a considerable extent, in his criticisms misconceives Cyril ; though, for this, Cyril had himself to thank. But neither is the language of Theodoret unexceptionable. He speaks of ' a man ' as ' assumed ' ⁵ ; of that man as ' God-bearing ',⁶ and as inseparably ' connected ' with the Word ⁷ ; and sometimes argues as if a human nature in Christ involves a distinct human personality.⁸ Yet they were nearer to each other, as Hooker points out,⁹ than either at the time would have admitted ; for each was then ' looking mainly at his own side of the shield '.¹⁰ Even then, it would seem, had only Apollinarianism been unequivocally disclaimed and the distinction of the divine and the human nature in Christ frankly acknowledged by Cyril, Theodoret would have been satisfied. But there was also the personal element to keep them apart : the polemical tone of Theodoret and the *hauteur* of

¹ *Op.* ix. 157-200 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 315-86); tr. in *M. M.* ii. 132 sqq. (*P. L.* xlviii. 931-70); Mansi, v. 19-82; Fleury, xxv. xxxi.

² e. g. His objection to "Ενωσις φυσική, Cyril, *Apol. c. Orient.* Anath. iii (*Op.* ix. 164; *P. G.* lxxvi. 325 D).

³ e. g. He imagined that when Cyril spoke of God the Word as our High Priest, he meant that He was so in His Godhead, *ibid.* Anath. x (*Op.* ix. 154; *P. G.* lxxvi. 360 c). ' Both parties reject the Arian notion (found, e. g. in Milton) "that our Lord's Priesthood preceded His Incarnation, and belonged to His Divine Nature, and was in consequence the token of an inferior divinity. . . . The Catholic Doctrine is that the Divine Word is Priest *in* and *according to* His Manhood", i. e. so far as relates to sacrificial Priesthood, as distinct from that sort of mediation which belongs to Him as Word,' W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 167, note o, quoting Newman, *Select Tr. Ath.* ⁷ ii. 245.

⁴ Cyril, *Op.* ix. 200-40 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 385-452); Mansi, v. 81-140; tr. *M. M.* *Op.* ii. 178 sqq. (*P. L.* xlviii. 969-1001); Fleury, xxv. xxxi.

⁵ *Apol. c. Thdt.* Anath. xii (*Op.* ix. 239; *P. G.* lxxvi. 449 B).

⁶ *Ibid.*, Anath. v (*Op.* ix. 220; *P. G.* lxxvi. 420 A).

⁷ *Ibid.*, Anath. iii (*Op.* ix. 210; *P. G.* lxxvi. 401 D).

⁸ *Ibid.*, Anath. viii (*Op.* ix. 225 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 428 sq.).

⁹ *E. P.* v. liii, § 4.

¹⁰ W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 149.

a Patriarch of Alexandria towards the bishop of 'the little town which, they tell me, is called Cyrus'.¹

(3) A similar asperity marks Cyril's reply to Nestorius, in five books, entitled *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias*,² i.e. to his sermons against Proclus. The author's method is, as before, to make extracts from his adversary, and then to comment: with the result that much of the writings of Nestorius, which would otherwise have been lost, is preserved, and that Cyril's work is prolix and wearisome to a degree. He disclaims all notions of fusion³; but insists on the necessity of the term *Theotokos* which, in these sermons, Nestorius had grudgingly admitted, and shows that it does not mean 'parent of the Godhead'.⁴ He criticizes the inadequate sense that Nestorius had put upon the Nicene Creed,⁵ and on the words of Scripture; contends that he had reduced the Incarnation to an 'association'⁶ of God with a man, or an 'indwelling'⁷ of God in a man; and asserts that, after the union, there was (in a phrase that, later on, was to give endless trouble) but 'one incarnate nature',⁸ though the context explains it to mean Godhead and manhood, 'essentially different' from each other, yet united in one Person. He exposes the merely verbal sense in which alone Nestorius could apply the term 'God' to the being whom he called Christ; and says that, on his theory, he cannot exclude the notion of two Sons.⁹ Had then the Divine Son Himself become Incarnate, or had He merely allied Himself to a man? Was the Gospel one of a human Saviour, or of the reunion of mankind with God through a Saviour, Divine in his Person as well as human in the nature which he vouchsafed to assume?¹⁰ This, according to Cyril, is the issue at stake: no verbal dispute, but a question between two versions of the Christian Creed, or rather between two creeds—the Christian doctrine of salvation, and something less.

¹ *Op.* ix. 201 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 388 A).

² *Op.* ix. 1-143 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 9-256); tr. *L. F.* xlvii; Fleury, xxv. xxxi.

³ *Adv. Nest.* i, § 3, 'Mixture' (*κρᾶσις*), as Nestorius fears, does not involve 'Confusion' (*ἀνάχυσις*), *Op.* ix. 15 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 33 B, D). On *κρᾶσις*, see *L. F.* x. 48, note h.

⁴ *Adv. Nest.* i, § 1 (*Op.* ix. 7; *P. G.* lxxvi. 20 c).

⁵ *Ibid.* i, §§ 7, 8 (*Op.* ix. 23 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 45 sq.).

⁶ *συνάφεια*, *ibid.* i, § 3 (*Op.* ix. 17; *P. G.* lxxvi. 36 D).

⁷ *ἐνοίκησις*, *ibid.* i, §§ 6, 8 (*Op.* ix. 23, 26; *P. G.* lxxvi. 45, 52 c).

⁸ *Μία φύσις τοῦ Λόγου σαρκαωμένη*, *ibid.* ii (*Op.* ix. 31; *P. G.* lxxvi. 60 sq.), and note in *L. F.* xlvii. 41, note c.

⁹ *Adv. Nest.* ii, § 1 (*Op.* ix. 35; *P. G.* lxxvi. 68 c).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op.* ix. 36 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 69 D), and *passim*.

(4) The above three works were composed before the Council met at Ephesus ; and, about the same time, i.e. early in 431, Cyril wrote, as well, to Caelestine, to ask, What shall be done if Nestorius recants ? Shall Cyril and his synod accept the recantation ? Or shall they refuse it, as not coming within the limit of ten days ?¹ A strange question, not only as opposed to justice and Christian charity ; but for the simple reason that the Imperial summons to a General Council *ipso facto* suspended the proceedings of the two Patriarchs. Cyril's letter has not come down to us, and we only know of its contents from Caelestine's reply² of 7 May 431. 'God willeth not the death of a sinner,' he answers ; and Cyril should do all in his power to win Nestorius back.

§ 11. The papal letter was still on the way to Alexandria when, shortly after Easter³ [19 April], 431, the bishops set out on their way to Ephesus for the Council.

(1) Caelestine, as it was the etiquette or the policy of popes to avoid attending General Councils in person, sent legates instead. They were two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip ; and their instructions,⁴ of 8 May 431, were to present the papal letter⁵ to the Synod, to consult Cyril and, saving the interests of the Apostolic See, to do as he thinks good.

(2) Some three weeks before Caelestine sent off his legates, Nestorius started from Constantinople.⁶ He was accompanied by ten bishops ; by several friends, among whom was the Count Irenaeus⁷ ; and by Count Candidian, captain of the Imperial Bodyguard, who was to represent the Emperor at the Council. Candidian carried with him an elaborate letter of instructions, forbidding him to take part in the discussion of doctrine, but commanding him to keep order and maintain freedom of speech.⁸ The traditions of Roman justice and good government were still powerful.

(3) Cyril⁹ took with him fifty bishops,¹⁰ about half the number

¹ Caelestine, *Ep.* xvi, § 2 (*P. L.* l. 501 sq.) ; Fleury, xxv. xlvii.

² *Ep.* xvi. 'Intelligo sententiam,' Jaffé, No. 377.

³ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxiv, §§ 1, 2 ; Fleury, xxv. xxxiv.

⁴ Caelestine, *Ep.* xvii (*P. L.* l. 503 A) ; Mansi, iv. 556 ; Jaffé, No. 378.

⁵ Caelestine, *Ep.* xviii (*P. L.* l. 505-12) ; *Conc. Eph.*, Act. II, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1283-8) ; Jaffé, No. 379.

⁶ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 2.

⁷ 'Simply out of friendship,' says the Imperial *Sacra, Conc. Eph.* i. xxxv (Mansi, iv. 1120 E).

⁸ *Conc. Eph.* i. xxxv (Mansi, iv. 1117-20) ; Fleury, xxv. xxxvi.

⁹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 3.

¹⁰ So says the letters of the rival Council at Ephesus, Mansi, iv. 1277 A.

of his suffragans. He had fair winds as far as Rhodes, whence he sent back a letter to his clergy and people.¹ But it was stormy afterwards.² He reached Ephesus, whence he wrote again to his church,³ some four or five days before Whit-Sunday, 7 June 431.

(4) On 12 June arrived Juvenal of Jerusalem⁴ with the bishops of Palestine. Flavian of Philippi, as proxy for the papal Vicar of Eastern Illyricum, viz. Rufus of Thessalonica, was there with the Macedonian bishops: while the Exarch of 'Asia', Memnon of Ephesus, 431-†40, itself, had got together some forty of his own suffragans and twelve from Pamphylia. One solitary deacon represented Africa: Besulas, who, after a long and dangerous journey, came on behalf of the once glorious church of Carthage. Capreolus, the Primate, 430-7, would have gladly acted on the letter of invitation that arrived too late to be handed to Augustine. He would have summoned a Council, and sent bishops to represent Africa at Ephesus. But the miseries of Africa, now lying at the mercy of the Vandal invaders, made it impossible. The roads were stopped, and travelling was dangerous. Capreolus, therefore, could do no more than send his deacon, Besulas, with a letter to the Synod,⁵ in which, after describing his own circumstances, he urged them to uphold the ancient faith and stand out against 'new doctrines hitherto unknown to the ears of churchmen'.⁶

§ 12. A fortnight elapsed, 7-21 June, 431, before the Council actually opened.

It was occupied by Cyril, as by other prelates, in strengthening his cause. Juvenal would be on his side; for he was contemplating the erection for himself of a Patriarchate of Jerusalem at the expense of Antioch, and would wish to conciliate the support of the powerful Patriarch of Alexandria. Memnon also could be counted on; for the see of Constantinople, under Chrysostom, had tried to extend its jurisdiction over the 'Dioceses' of 'Asia' and Pontus. Nestorius and his allies would say that it was the situation of thirty years previously over again: as Theophilus had come to depose John, here was his nephew bent on the humiliation of the Imperial See again. They accused Cyril and Memnon of terrorism,

¹ *Ep.* xx (*Op.* ix. 81 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 127 sqq.); *Conc. Eph.* i. xxxiii (Mansi, iv. 1116).

² *Apol. ad Theod. Imp.* (*Op.* ix. 256 sq.; *P. L.* lxxvi. 480 D); *Conc. Eph.* iii. xiii (Mansi, v. 249 B).

³ *Ep.* xxi (*Op.* ix. 82 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvi. 129 sqq.); *Conc. Eph.* i. xxxiv (Mansi, iv. 1117).

⁴ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 3.

⁵ *Conc. Eph.* Actio i, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1207-12).

⁶ *Ibid.* iv. 1210 c.

probably not without cause. Memnon shut the churches of Ephesus against the Nestorians, and Cyril was a violent man in whose eyes Nestorius was already a heretic. This much is clear from the vehemence of Cyril's language against him in sermons which he preached during this fortnight's delay ; though we may well doubt the genuineness of the *Encomium in S. Mariam Deiparam*,¹ with its string of ' Hail Mary's ' and its description of Caelestine as ' archbishop of the whole world '.² Some of the friends of Nestorius took advantage of the respite to try to win him over. Thus Acacius, bishop of Melitene, 431-8, ' thought he had got him, at least in words, to retract '. But Nestorius answered with a dilemma : ' Either you deny that the Godhead of the Son was incarnate, and, if so, you agree with me : or you must maintain that the Godhead of the Father and of the Holy Ghost was incarnate also.'³ There was an undue straining here of the principle of the Divine Coinherence⁴ ; for it is the one Godhead as existing in the Son to which the Incarnation is referred,⁵ and this came out again during the interval of waiting. Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra 431-8, said that he heard Nestorius affirm, during these days of delay, ' For my own part, never would I call a child of two or three months old God ' ⁶ ; though what Nestorius afterwards claimed that he said or meant was simply that ' God was not two or three months old '. Whatever the exact words used—and much turns upon whether ' God ' is subject or predicate in the sentence—the conversation of 19 June, in which they were used, was reported to the Council ; and then it was that the Council perceived it was not a question of words but of ideas. The sentence was enough, and closed all attempts to win Nestorius over.

Meanwhile, the delay itself was due to the non-arrival of John of Antioch. His bishops could not start till after Low Sunday, 26 April ; and it would then take them twelve days to reach Antioch. From thence to Ephesus would be thirty more : so that, allowing for a day in Antioch, John and his ' Orientals ' could not arrive in Ephesus before 8 June, the day after Pentecost,⁷ when the Council was to begin. But the bishops already at Ephesus were

¹ *Hom.* xi (*Op.* x. 379-85 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 1029-40).

² *Ibid.* (*Op.* x. 384 ; *P. G.* lxxxvii. 1040 B).

³ *Conc. Eph.* Actio I, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1181 E).

⁴ On which see Newman, *Select. Tr. Ath.*⁷ ii. 72 sqq. ; W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 134, 190.

⁵ R. Hooker, *E. P.* v. li, §§ 2, 3.

⁶ *Conc. Eph.* Actio I, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1181 C) ; *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 5.

⁷ Evagrius, *H. E.* i, § 3 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2428) ; Fleury, xxv. xxxiv.

getting impatient. It was expensive living there. The weather was hot ; and some died.¹ Cyril and his friends, who could not forget that John disliked the Twelve Anathematisms, got more uneasy, and began to persuade themselves that they might begin without him. They suspected him of loitering on the way, and of pursuing a Fabian policy that he might not have to join in the condemnation of Nestorius ; but there is no sufficient evidence for it.² John left Antioch 18 May³ ; and about Sunday, 21 June, Cyril received a letter from him to say that he was sorry to be late : he had been travelling incessantly for a month ; but now hoped to arrive within five or six days.⁴ Meantime, two of his neighbours, Alexander of Apamea, 431-4, in Syria II, and Alexander of Hierapolis, 431-4, in Augusta-Euphratensis, came on in advance with a message to the bishops ; bidding them, in case he should still be detained, not to wait but to proceed to business.⁵ Nestorius and his friends, however, proposed to wait ; and they had the support of the High Commissioner, Count Candidian. But in vain. Cyril would not wait. He could not have expected defeat, for he had a clear majority—some fifty suffragans of his own, about a hundred votes commanded by Memnon, and fifteen Palestinian bishops ranged behind Juvenal. He could not have anything to fear from Imperial displeasure. But he did fear that the influence of John would be in excess of the numbers he could muster—thirty in all—and that it would be exerted to revise his Twelve Anathematisms. Besides, he wanted to get Nestorius condemned out of hand. For this, he risked the appearance of having snatched a verdict ; and his ‘ fault brought its own punishment ’, as Dr. Neale points out, ‘ in the confusions that ensued ’.⁶ But, for the moment, the opportunity was his, and he was not the man to let it slip. It was a question, too, whether he or Nestorius was to be put on his trial ; and, if John carried weight on his arrival, then Cyril might find himself the accused. To avoid this fate he had better begin at once, and so be judge. The term within which all prelates were to be present, according to the Imperial Citation, had already gone by, a fortnight ago⁷ ; and on Sunday, 21 June, Nestorius received

¹ *Conc. Eph.* Actio v, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1332 A).

² Garnier, a thoroughgoing partisan, says John was to blame, *Praef. in sec. part. M. M.* (P. L. xlviii. 719) : but see Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 258 n.

³ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 388.

⁴ *Conc. Eph.* i, c. xxxvi (Mansi, iv. 1121) ; Cyril, *Ep.* xxii (*Op.* x. 83 ; P. G. lxxvii. 132).

⁵ *Conc. Eph.* Act. v, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1332 B).

⁶ *Patr. Al.* i. 258 n.

⁷ *Conc. Eph.* Act. v, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1332 A).

a summons, at the hands of four bishops, to attend the next day. 'I'll see,' was his answer ¹; and sixty-eight bishops of his party entered a protest ² in favour of waiting the arrival of John. Candidian also strained every nerve in favour of delay.³ He dared not enforce it, for the populace sided with Cyril and Memnon. But, as the members of the Council were assembling 'in the church at Ephesus called Mary,'⁴ he hastened thither and said that it was the Emperor's will that none should assemble apart from the rest but that all should be done in common.⁵ Pressed for his authority, he at last produced his instructions,⁶ in the form of 'The Adorable Divine Letter' to the Council, which he read.⁷ They brushed it aside: whereupon Candidian withdrew, after further protest by his *Contestatio* ⁸ in favour of delay.

§ 13. The Gospels being placed upon the throne in token of the presence of our Lord,⁹ the Council opened ¹⁰ on Monday, 22 June 431, with one hundred and fifty-eight bishops present, beside the deacon representing the Church of Africa. Some forty more gave in their adhesion later, so that the whole number came to close upon two hundred at the end.¹¹ Cyril presided. His own see gave him the right to the chair; but he also claimed to be the representative of Pope Caelestinus, in virtue of the commission ¹² of the previous year. Whether this claim was well-founded is another question. He had been entrusted with the task of summoning Nestorius and deposing him, in the name of the Pope; unless, within ten days, he should recant. But another process had supervened upon this, viz. the Imperial project of a General Council. Cyril's commission had therefore lapsed ¹³; and, at the Council,

¹ *Conc. Eph.*, Act. I, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1132).

² *Synodicon*, c. vii (Mansi, v. 756-8); Fleury, xxv. xxxvi; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 259.

³ *Synodicon*, c. ix (Mansi, v. 770-2); Fleury, xxv. xxxvi.

⁴ *Conc. Eph.*, Act. v, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1332 c); and see note in L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 349, n. 3.

⁵ See Candidian's account of what he did in *Acta Conciliabuli Ephesini* (Mansi, iv. 1260 sq.); Fleury, xxv. xlv.

⁶ *Conc. Eph.* I. xxxv (Mansi, iv. 1117-20).

⁷ Mansi, iv. 1129 E. ⁸ *Synodicon*, c. iv (*ut sup.*).

⁹ *Conc. Eph.* III. xiii (Mansi, v. 241 A) = Cyril, *Op.* ix. 251 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 472 B); and the Gospels were appealed to in adjurations, Mansi, iv. 1181 A.

¹⁰ Mansi, iv. 1123; Fleury, xxv. xxxvii.

¹¹ For the names, Mansi, iv. 1123-8.

¹² Given in *Tristitiae nostrae* of 11 Aug. 430 (Caelestinus, *Ep.* xi; Jaffé, No. 372).

¹³ W. Bright, *Age of the Fathers*, ii. 311; E. Denny, *Papalism*; Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, iii. 349, n. 1. All agree on this point.

though Cyril still claimed to have Caelestine's proxy, as Flavian, for instance, held that of Rufus of Thessalonica, the Pope was actually represented by his legates. Next to Cyril in dignity, at the opening session, came Juvenal of Jerusalem and Memnon of Ephesus ; after them, Flavian, as proxy for Rufus ; and then six other metropolitans.¹

§ 14. For the first month or so Cyril had it, on the whole, his own way. At *Session I*, 22 June, after a second and a third citation² had been served upon Nestorius and repudiated by him, the debate began.³ It was formally proposed by Juvenal that the Council should proceed to the question of faith⁴ ; and they read in succession (1) the Creed of Nicaea⁵ ; (2) the *Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius*,⁶ which was declared by the bishops one by one⁷ to be consonant with the Creed, and then approved by acclamation ; (3) the letter of Nestorius in reply,⁸ which the bishops rejected with anathemas, and as incompatible with the Creed⁹ ; (4) Caelestine's letter to Nestorius, i.e. *Aliquantis diebus*¹⁰ of 11 August 430 ; and (5) that by which Cyril had signified to Nestorius the terms of submission demanded of him, i.e. *Cum salvator* of November 430, with the now famous anathematisms.¹¹ But this *Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius* was accepted in silence¹² by the Council, not formally and with comment by individual bishops as was the second or as was the *Tome* of St. Leo at Chalcedon¹³ ; nor were there any acclamations. It is a moot point, therefore, how much of oecumenical approval was then bestowed upon the Twelve Anathematisms.¹⁴ Next (6) the depositions of various bishops were taken as to what Nestorius had said in their hearing—specially of Theopemptus and Daniel,¹⁵ two of the four who took him *Cum Salvator* to Constantinople, and of Theodotus of Ancyra,¹⁶ and of Acacius of Melitene¹⁷ to whom, in the conversation of three days previously, he had made compromising statements. Then followed the reading (7) of a series of passages from Doctors approved by the

¹ Mansi, iv. 1124 B.

² Ibid. 1130-2 for the first ; 1132-3, for the second ; 1133-7, for the third ; and Fleury, xxv. xxxviii.

³ Fleury, xxv. xxxix.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1137 A, B.

⁵ Ibid. 1137 C.

⁶ Ibid. 1137 D, E.

⁷ Ibid. 1137 E-1169 B.

⁸ = Cyril, *Ep.* v ; for its reading, Mansi, iv. 1169 B, C.

⁹ For their comments see ibid. 1169 C-1177 D : thirty-four spoke.

¹⁰ *Ep.* xiii ; Jaffé, No. 374 ; for its reading, Mansi, iv. 1177 E.

¹¹ Ibid. 1179 A, B.

¹² Mansi, iv. 1180 B.

¹³ Ibid. vii. 9 sqq.

¹⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 358 sqq. ; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 252, n. 2.

¹⁵ Mansi, v. 1180 D.

¹⁶ Ibid. 1181 C.

¹⁷ Ibid. 1181 D, E.

Church, twelve in all,¹ the most interesting being extracts from Athanasius² and Gregory Nazianzen³; (8) of extracts from the writings of Nestorius⁴; and, finally, (9) of the letter of Capreolus, Primate of Africa.⁵ Its request for the rejection of novelties fell in with the temper of the Council, and drew from them shouts of 'So say we all: that is what we all want'.⁶ At the end of a long summer's day—for lights were now being brought in—the bishops proceeded to sentence of deposition and excommunication against Nestorius.⁷ The document was signed by an hundred and ninety-eight bishops. They were escorted home with rapturous cries by the multitude; the ladies of Ephesus preceded them to their lodgings with lights and incense; and the city was illuminated.⁸

It was a great triumph. But 'more haste, less speed'. Next day, it is true, the sentence was sent, 23 June, to 'Nestorius, the new Judas'⁹; but all concerned—Cyril, as well as Nestorius and Candidian—wrote to the Emperor or to their friends in Constantinople and Alexandria,¹⁰ while Cyril and his party were proclaiming their triumph in sermons¹¹ at Ephesus. But their self-congratulation proved a little premature; for on Friday, 26 June,¹² the caravan of the Orientals arrived in Ephesus,¹³ and John, without even waiting to change his travelling-dress,¹⁴ displayed his resentment against Cyril by proceeding at once to hold a Council¹⁵ in his

¹ Ibid. 1184-96 D.

² *Orat. c. Ar.* iii, § 33 (*Op.* ii. 42; *P. G.* xxvi. 393 sq.); and *Ad Epictetum* §§ 2, 7 (*Op.* ii. 721, 4; *P. G.* xxvi. 1053, 1061).

³ *Ep. ci* (*Op.* iii. 85 sq.; *P. G.* xxxvii. 177 B-184 A).

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1196-1208 c; Fleury, xxv. xli.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 1208 D-1212 A; Fleury, xxv. xli.

⁶ Mansi, iv. 1212 B.

⁷ Ibid. 1212-26.

⁸ Cyril, *Ep.* xxiv (*Op.* x. 87; *P. G.* lxxvii. 137 c); *Conc. Eph.*, Actio I, c. ix (Mansi, iv. 1241 E). Note this for the origin of ecclesiastical ceremonies in the social customs of the time.

⁹ Mansi, iv. 1228 A; Fleury, xxv. xlii.

¹⁰ Cyril wrote to the Church of CP., to the Emperor, to the Clergy and People of CP., to the Clergy and People of Alexandria, and to the monks of Egypt, *Conc. Eph.*, Actio I, cc. iv, vii-x (Mansi, iv. 1228, 1235-46); Cyril, *Epp.* xxiv-xxvi (*Op.* x. 87-90; *P. G.* lxxvii. 137-42); Fleury, xxv. xliii, xliv. Nestorius wrote to the Emperor, *Conc. Eph.*, Actio I, c. vi (Mansi, iv. 1231-6); Loofs, 186 sqq.; Fleury, xxv. xliv. The report of Candidian to the Emperor is not extant, but is mentioned in the Imperial Response to the Synod (Mansi, iv. 1377 c).

¹¹ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio I, cc. xi-xiii (Mansi, iv. 1245-58); Fleury, xxv. xliv.

¹² So Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, iii. 353.

¹³ Fleury, xxv. xlv; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 264.

¹⁴ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio IV, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1333 B).

¹⁵ *Acta Conciliabuli Ephesini* in Mansi, iv. 1259 sqq., 1371 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 314-20 (E. Tr. iii. 56-8); Fleury, xxv. xlv.

lodgings to deal with the situation. Forty-three bishops composed it, and Candidian presented himself to describe what had passed. They were of opinion that Cyril had simply hastened on the condemnation of Nestorius to escape being put on his defence himself. There was something in the charge ; but the Orientals went on to put themselves no less in the wrong. For without waiting, without sending a summons or inviting a discussion, they pronounced sentence of deposition on Cyril and Memnon, and excommunicated all their adherents unless and until they should repudiate the Twelve Anathematisms. There was little to choose between this party or that for moderation and fair-play ; but, when John attempted to consecrate a successor to Memnon, in accordance with the sentence of deposition, the churches were closed against him. Candidian, meanwhile, sent report after report to the Emperor ; and, 29 June, there arrived a Rescript reprimanding Cyril for his hasty measures, ordering that no prelate should leave the city, and announcing an Imperial Commissioner to be sent shortly.¹ But within ten days or so, the arrival on Friday, 10 July, of the Roman legates² altered the balance of parties at Ephesus, and inclined it once more to the side of Cyril. They were three in number : two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, of whose sees no mention is made in the documents, and Philip, ' priest of the Church of the Apostles ', whose acquaintance we have already made as one of the legates of Zosimus in the affair of Apiarius. Their instructions were to support Cyril³ ; and they now placed themselves wholly at his disposal. Nor was he slow to avail himself of their aid ; for on 10 July was held *Session II*⁴ of the Council, this time in the house of Memnon, where Cyril again presided as in his own right, but claimed to ' act also as proxy for Caelestine '.⁵ The legates were then introduced, and read *Spiritus Sancti*⁶ of 8 May, 431, in which Caelestine addressed the Synod. The charge to teach, he would have them observe, has descended equally upon all bishops. The command that we have received is a general order, devolving equally upon all. We ought all alike to enter into the labours of those whom we have succeeded in dignity : and so be

¹ Mansi, iv. 1377-80 ; Fleury, xxv. xlvi.

² Mansi, iv. 1281 A ; Fleury, xxv. xlvii.

³ Fleury, xxv. xlvii.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1279 sqq.

⁵ Mansi, iv. 1280 E ; and Newman's note in Fleury, iii. 91, n. y.

⁶ Caelestine, *Ep.* xviii (*P. L.* l. 505-12) ; *Conc. Eph.*, Actio II, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1283-8) ; Fleury, xxv. xlvii ; E. Denny, *Papalism*, § 373.

true to that which has hitherto been retained by the Apostolic Succession.¹ The letter, it will be observed, is based not upon the papal, but upon the conciliar, theory of the constitution of the Church. Not that Caelestine underrates or overlooks the dignity of his see ; for his legates ' are to be present at all the proceedings and to carry out what has already been decided by us '.² But the episcopate, as a whole and acting in common, is served heir by Caelestine to the Apostolate ; and he ranks himself with his colleagues, treating the matter throughout as one to be settled by the Council.³ They loudly expressed their approval. ' One Caelestine : one Cyril,' they shouted : ' one Faith of the Council.'⁴ The legates were then formally acquainted with the minutes of what had taken place before their arrival.⁵ Next day, at *Session III* ⁶ of Saturday, 11 July, they were formally read ; and Philip, after magnifying the primacy of Peter,⁷ assented on the Pope's behalf to the deposition of Nestorius⁸ and the sentence pronounced against him by the Council. Letters were sent to inform the Emperor⁹ and the church of Constantinople¹⁰ : and the third session ended. Five days later, at *Session IV* of Thursday, 16 July, ' in the church that is called Mary '¹¹, they twice summoned¹² John of Antioch and his supporters who refused to attend ; and there was a deadlock till next day, 17 July, at *Session V*, on a third citation,¹³ John, through the archdeacon of Nestorius—' We do not know his name ' any more than Cyril's messenger who was shown the door by the archdeacon, ' but he was a little pale man, with a few stray hairs in his beard, and he had a paper in his hand '¹⁴—declined all further communication with the majority under Cyril. They excommunicated John and his adherents to the number of thirty-

¹ *Ep.* xviii, § 2 (*P. L.* l. 505 sq.).

² *Ep.* xviii, § 5 (*P. L.* l. 511 A).

³ Whence it is that the Gallicans were fond of quoting this letter, e. g. J. B. Bossuet [1627–†1704], *Defensio declarationis cleri Gallicani*, III. vii, § 14 (*Op.* xxxii. 456–8, ed. 1817); Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 364; Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 375–6.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1288 D.

⁵ *Ibid.* 1289 D, E.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1291–1306.

⁷ e. g. ' Nulli dubium . . . Petrus apostolorum princeps et caput . . . semper in suis successoribus vivit,' *ib.* 1295 B, C. For this theory of the mystical presence of Peter in his successors, see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 178 sqq., and C. Gore, *St. Leo*, 93.

⁸ *Ibid.* 1300 D, E.

⁹ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio III, c. i (Mansi, iv. 1301–4).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, c. ii (iv. 1303–6). ff

¹¹ Mansi, iv. 1305 B.

¹² *Ibid.* iv. 1309 B and 1312 E; Fleury, xxv. l, li.

¹³ *Ibid.* iv. 1320 C; for *Conc. Eph.*, Actio III, see *ibid.* iv. 1317–42; Fleury, xxv. li; Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 266 sq.

¹⁴ Mansi, iv. 1321 R.

five¹; and, as before, sent reports of what they had done to the Emperor² and to the Pope.³

§ 15. But it was the end of Cyril's triumph for the time being; and the centre of interest or, rather, of intrigue is now transferred from the Council to the Court, where all turned on the question, Which of the two parties at Ephesus could gain the Imperial ear? At first, the majority found it impossible to send messages to the Emperor; for Count Candidian at one end, the agents of Nestorius at the other, blocked all communication between the Council and the capital.⁴ At last, about July, a beggar carried in his cane a letter from Cyril to the bishops and monks at Constantinople.⁵ The clergy petitioned the Emperor; but, perhaps, their entreaties would have carried but little weight, had not the old abbot Dalmatius, †440, intervened to open the mind of Theodosius to the true state of the case and to enlist his sympathies on the side of orthodoxy. He had served in the Guards of Theodosius I⁶; and for forty-eight years, since his profession, had never left his monastery. Now he sallied forth, at the head of all the monks and archimandrites of the city, to interview the Emperor. They went in procession to the palace, chanting antiphonally as they went. Dalmatius and the archimandrites were at once admitted; and, in a brief audience, the old man broke the spell by which Nestorius and his friends had so long held Theodosius bound. He then went out to his supporters, and told them, in the church of St. Mocius, of the success of his visit. He had induced the Emperor to receive some deputies of the Council, so that Cyril, at last, could obtain a hearing.⁷ The envoys presently arrived, in the persons of Theopemptus and Daniel.⁸ But the minority had also put in representations by letter⁹; and now, on the heels of these two prelates, arrived Count Irenaeus, the friend of Nestorius, to plead his cause. Irenaeus had

¹ Ibid. iv. 1324 sq.; Fleury, xxv. li. The number is understated: see Mansi, iv. 1336 E; Duchesne, iii. 357, n. 2.

² Mansi, iv. 1325-30; Fleury, xxv. liii.

³ Mansi, iv. 1329-38; Fleury, xxv. liii. This *Relatio* or 'Report' gives an account of all that had passed, and is therefore a valuable authority—from the point of view of the Council. They also say that they have 'confirmed' Caelestine's 'decisions' in the case of the Pelagians (Mansi, iv. 1337 B), a phrase hardly acceptable to papalists. ⁴ Mansi, iv. 1428 B.

⁵ The letter is now lost, but was given by Dalmatius to the Emperor, ibid. 1429 c. ⁶ Fleury, xxv. xliii.

⁷ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, cc. ix, x (Mansi, iv. 1427-30); Fleury, xxvi. vi.

⁸ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. xviii (Mansi, iv. 1447 sq.); Cyril, *Ep.* xxviii (*Op.* x. 91 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 143-6); Fleury, xxvi. iii.

⁹ *Relatio Orientalium ad Imp.* (Mansi, iv. 1371-4); Fleury, xxv. liv.

succeeded in procuring an order for the deposition of Cyril, when he too was checkmated by the arrival and superior resources¹ of John, Cyril's chaplain and physician. The order was countermanded ; and Theodosius was advised to take the extraordinarily illogical step of treating Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius as alike deposed, and to send a new Commissioner to Ephesus.²

§ 16. The Council, while its future was thus hanging in the balance, held its final sessions.

At *Session VI*,³ of 22 July, Charisius, priest and church-steward of Philadelphia, came forward and made a statement.⁴ Twenty-one sectaries in Lydia, he said, Novatianists and Quartodecimans, had been desirous of joining the Church. They had been induced by James and Antony, two Nestorianizing clergy of Constantinople, to adopt, as the Catholic symbol, what was, in fact, a Nestorian formulary,⁵ and is ascribed by Marius Mercator to Theodore.⁶ They were ignorant persons, and had been imposed upon : so the Council passed their case over when their names⁷ had been read.⁸ But it then enacted ' that no one should present, or compose, or frame a Creed different from that of Nicaea ; and that, whosoever should so compose, or propose, or offer one to persons wishing to come over to the Church, should, if clerics, be deposed and, if laymen, be anathematized '.⁹ In order to secure uniformity in this matter of receiving converts, it would have been useless for the Council to prohibit any creed differing in purport from the Creed of Nicaea. They must therefore be understood to mean by a ' different creed ' any other form of words than that contained in the Nicene Creed ; and this is the sense that Cyril himself put upon the prohibition. But the prohibition does not exclude all use of any creed or formulary beside the Nicene ; it only concerns itself with creeds to be subscribed by converts and to take the rank of a baptismal creed. It does not touch our use of the Athanasian

¹ i. e. bribes, *Synodicon*, c. xli (Mansi, v. 819) ; Fleury, xxv. lv ; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 361.

² *Ep. Comit. Irenaei ad Orientales* (Mansi, iv. 1391-4) ; Fleury, xxv. lv.

³ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi (Mansi, iv. 1341 sqq.) ; Fleury, xxv. lvi.

⁴ For this statement, as summarized by Peter, the chief notary of the Council, see Mansi, iv. 1344 sq. ; and for the *libellus* of Charisius, Actio vi, c. ii (Mansi, iv. 1345-8).

⁵ q.v. in *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. iii (Mansi, iv. 1347-52).

⁶ M. M. *Op.* ii. 251 sqq. (*P. L.* xlviii. 1043-6).

⁷ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. iv (Mansi, iv. 1351-62).

⁸ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. v (Mansi, iv. 1361).

⁹ Canon 7, W. Bright, *Canons* 2, xxviii. sq., 131-4.

Creed ; but it is incompatible with the Western use of the Apostles' Creed. The *Quicumque vult* is never used as a catechetical or baptismal formulary ; the Apostles' Creed is.

At this point in the *Acta* occurs a sermon of Cyril's, important in one connexion. It is one of the few places in his writings in which he expressly says that our Lord's manhood was a human 'nature' (*φύσις*)¹: 'nature', with him, being usually applied only to the Godhead.

At *Session VII*,² of July 31, advantage was taken of the breach with John of Antioch and his consequent absence from the synod of the majority, to deal a blow at the claims of his see to jurisdiction in Cyprus. The authority of Antioch over Cyprus had been submitted by Alexander of Antioch, 413-†21, to the judgement of Innocent I ; and the Pope, on the strength of Alexander's assertions,³ had ordered that the Patriarch of Antioch should not only consecrate the metropolitan of Cyprus but should be consulted before the appointment, in the island, even of a simple bishop. The metropolitical see lay at Salamis [Constantia] ; and, on the death of its incumbent, Troilus, early in 431, John of Antioch had procured letters⁴ from Dionysius, Duke of 'The East', to the governor of Cyprus and the clergy of Constantia, forbidding them to proceed to the appointment of a successor till the Council of Ephesus had given its instructions. But no notice was taken of the prohibition. Reginus was elected ; came to Ephesus as a violently anti-Nestorian partisan⁵ ; and now seized the opportunity to state his case,⁶ in revenge upon John. Nothing loath, the Council listened : and, on one of its members asking, 'What was the object of him of Antioch' ? Evagrius, a Cypriot bishop, replied : 'To subjugate our island : he wanted to secure the prerogative of ordaining our bishops contrary to canon and custom.'⁷ Here, then, was the point. The Council inquired (1) whether any bishop of Antioch had ever been known to ordain a bishop in Cyprus ; (2) whether it was certain that no such right had existed when the sixth canon of Nicaea reserved all its rights to the see of Antioch ; and (3) whether the last three metropolitans—Troilus, Sabinus, and 'the

¹ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio VI, c. vii (Mansi, iv. 1369 E).

² *Conc. Eph.*, Actio VII (Mansi, iv. 1465-82) ; Fleury, xxv. lvii.

³ 'Sane asseris,' Innocent, *Ep.* xxiv, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 549 A), and Newman's note in Fleury, iii. 114, n. 1.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1467 sqq.

⁵ See his sermon preached there, *Conc. Eph.*, Actio I, c. xi (Mansi, iv. 1245-8).

⁶ See his *libellus* in Mansi, iv. 1465-7.

⁷ *Ibid.* 1468 c.

venerable Epiphanius'—had been consecrated by the insular bishops. To each of these queries an emphatic 'Yes' was given in reply by the Cypriot bishop, Zeno.¹ It was a case of Zeno *versus* Alexander; of testimony taken for granted, and not cross-examined, on either side. A modern tribunal would have refused a decision. But not so a Pope or a Council. The Synod reversed the Pope's decision, and gave a *contingent* judgement in favour of the Cypriot claims.² Had John been present he might, perhaps, have made good the claims of his predecessor, Alexander; though what evidence he could have produced we do not know. As it fell out, the 'autocephalous' position enjoyed to this day by the church of Cyprus was eventually established by the appropriate discovery, c. 488, of the body of St. Barnabas in his native soil. The decision then expands into a general principle: no prelate is 'to take possession of any province which has not been from the first subject' to his own see 'lest the arrogance of secular power creep in under cover of the episcopal office'. The phrase is singularly like that in which the Africans had repudiated the claims of Caelestine in the matter of Apiarius. Besulas may have revived it, and put it into the mouth of the Council. But, phraseology apart, they were emphatic about the independent rights of province and metropolitan, as against invasion on the part of more powerful neighbours. But their canon was not equal to preventing the gradual enlargement of the original Patriarchate of Rome at its expense: while it was deliberately set aside by the Council of Chalcedon. That Council, at one stroke, subjected three 'Dioceses', including twenty-eight provinces, to the see of Constantinople.³

§ 17. Here, properly speaking, save for the six canons enforcing its decisions, the Council of Ephesus and its proceedings came to an end. But its troubles were now to begin. In August, 431, Count John, the new High Commissioner, arrived at Ephesus. He brought with him a letter—*Quanto pietatis*⁴—in which Theodosius exhibited his ignorance of the actual state of affairs there: for he gravely informs Pope Caelestine, Rufus of Thessalonica, and others who had never been at Ephesus that he had accepted the deposition of all three prelates—Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon—'as intimated

¹ Mansi, iv. 1468 C-E.

² Canon 8, *ibid.* 1469; W. Bright, *Canons*², xxix sq., 135-9; E. Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 382-5.

³ *sc.* Pontus, Asia, and Thrace: see Canon 28: W. Bright, *Canons*², xlvii.

⁴ Mansi, iv. 1395-8; Fleury, xxvi. i.

to Us by Your Piety'. John placed the two former under arrest at once; before the day was out he had Memnon under guard too, though he had been absent at first; and, in the evening, he sent a report¹ to the Emperor of the satisfactory issue of his first day's proceedings. In it he not only suppressed the fact that the adherents of Cyril were in the majority, but represented them as in the wrong. Such was the situation—a deadlock, when each side could do little but console itself by writing to its friends. Thus the Orientals wrote to the Emperor² by Count John; then, dropping all mention, for the time, of Nestorius, to Antioch;³ finally, in much the same terms, to Acacius of Beroea,⁴ congratulating themselves and their well-wishers at a distance on the arrest of Cyril and Memnon. They, in their turn, wrote a professedly Synodical Letter to the Emperor,⁵ remonstrating in the name of the Council, and asking for the restoration of its 'heads'.⁶ The Council reiterated the request, in a further letter to Theodosius⁷; and, meanwhile, Count John endeavoured to persuade them to hold communion with the Orientals. The Cyrillines at this stage would not, but the Orientals would, go so far as to draw up a formulary which might serve as the basis of reconciliation. It was drawn up for the Emperor, and contained a short doctrinal statement in which Mary was owned as *Theotokos* 'inasmuch as God the Word became incarnate; and, from the moment of conception, united to Himself the temple which He derived from her'.⁸ Unless 'temple' here meant a human person, the statement was quite orthodox. It was a great advance from the side of John; and was the work, or was issued with the approval, of Theodoret. The document may rank as a moderate statement of anti-Cyrilline orthodoxy; and it became, when proposed by John,⁹ and accepted by Cyril,¹⁰ the *Formulary of Reunion* and, as such, one of the most momentous of credal or doctrinal formularies in the history of the Church. But, for the present, it lay waiting its future; and the

¹ Mansi, iv. 1397 sq.; Fleury, xxvi. i.

² *Synodicon*, c. xvii (Mansi, v. 781–4). This letter contained the Oriental Confession of Faith, which afterwards became the *Formulary of Reunion* between Cyril and John.

³ *Synodicon*, c. xviii (Mansi, v. 784 sq.).

⁴ *Ibid.*, c. xix (785 sq.); Fleury, xxvi. iv.

⁵ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. xv (Mansi, iv. 1441–4); Fleury, xxvi. ii.

⁶ Mansi, iv. 1444 B.

⁷ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. xii (Mansi, iv. 1433–6); Fleury, xxvi. ii.

⁸ *Synodicon*, c. xvii (Mansi, v. 783 c, d).

⁹ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxviii (*Op.* x. 103; *P. G.* lxxvii. 172); Mansi, v. 292.

¹⁰ Cyril, *Ep.* xxix (*Op.* x. 105 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 176 sq.).

majority wrote to the clergy and people of Constantinople as from a 'prison' at Ephesus—'Let us be admitted to lay our case before the Emperor: or let us be allowed to go'.¹ There was a note appended, meant, it is thought, to secure once more the intercession of Dalmatius. 'The heat is intolerable; there are funerals every day; pray let the Emperor know of our distressing state.'² Their description of their plight is borne out, by an incidental allusion of Cyril's, in a letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople; and he adds that the pecuniary difficulties of the bishops were increasing their distress.³ In similar strain he wrote to three of his suffragans—Theopemptus, Daniel, and Potammon—now in the capital: 'Here are our lives: but communicate with the Orientals we will not, until they disown Nestorius.'⁴ The clergy of Constantinople were not deaf to these appeals. They addressed a remonstrance to the Emperor,⁵ begging him to support the decisions of Cyril and the majority; and Dalmatius, it would seem, interposed again, for there is a letter of his to the Council in which he tells them that he has acted upon their request.⁶ Alypius also, priest of the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople where were the tombs of its Emperors and Bishops, wrote to Cyril a laudatory epistle, assuring him of all that was being done there on his behalf.⁷ He treats him with great respect as the successor of Athanasius; in marked contrast to the tone adopted towards him by another of his correspondents at this time, the abbot Isidore of Pelusium, †440. Letters written from Ephesus against Cyril had left an unfavourable impression of him on the mind of Isidore; and he thought it his duty to warn his Patriarch. 'Sympathy', he begins, 'may not see clearly: but antipathy does not see at all. If you would avoid both these faults, pass no violent sentences, but investigate matters equitably. Many of those at Ephesus accuse you of pursuing a private quarrel; instead of seeking, in an orthodox spirit, the things that are Christ's. Cyril, they say, is

¹ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio VI, c. xvi (Mansi, iv. 1443–8); Fleury, xxvi. iii.

² *Ibid.*, c. xvii (1447 sq.).

³ *Ibid.*, c. xiii (1435–8) = Cyril, *Ep.* xxvii (*Op.* x. 90 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 141 sq.).

⁴ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio VI, c. xviii (Mansi, iv. 1447 sq.) = Cyril, *Ep.* xxviii. (*Op.* x. 91 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 143 sq.); and for their answer, Actio VI, c. xix (1449 sq.); Fleury, xxvi. vii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, c. xxi (1453–6); Fleury, xxvi. vi.
⁶ É. Baluze, *Conc. nova collectio*, i. 653 sq. (Paris, 1683); M. M. (*P. L.* xlviii. 731 sqq.); Fleury, xxvi. vii; and for the Council's thanks, *ibid.* and Fleury, xxvi. viii.

⁷ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio VI, c. xxiv (Mansi, iv. 1463 sq.); Fleury, xxvi. vii.

nephew to Theophilus. He wants to be taken for a man of consequence, like his uncle ; who wreaked his fury upon the blessed John ; though, to be sure, there is a considerable difference between him and Nestorius.' ¹ And about the same time Isidore wrote even to Theodosius, urging him, as if with Cyril's well-known temper in view, not to leave things to be settled by ill-regulated passion, but to go to Ephesus in person : the sentence of the Council would then be superior to all censure.² This it was neither wise nor possible for Theodosius to do. But, at last, while Isidore's strictures drew from Cyril in prison his *Explicatio duodecim capitum*,³ the Emperor consented to give audience to eight delegates from the Council⁴ and eight from its rival assembly.⁵ Laudably anxious not to rouse a tumult at Constantinople, he received them at Chalcedon,⁶ 11 September 431. They could not agree ; and the Emperor, convinced that it would not be advisable to break with the majority, dissolved the Council.⁷ He refrained from any condemnation of the Orientals ; but *de facto* accepted its decisions by sending Nestorius back to his monastery at Antioch,⁸ September 431, and causing the eight deputies of the majority to proceed to the consecration, 25 October, of Maximian,⁹ an aged and pious priest who had been a pupil of Chrysostom and was well known at Rome,¹⁰ as archbishop of Constantinople, 431-†4, in place of Nestorius. The rival parties then went home. The Oriental deputies, before they departed, accused Cyril of having won his case by bribery¹¹ ; and Theodoret, their leading theologian, delivered a sermon in which he relieved his feelings by inveighing against the victorious Cyrillines as 'hatchers of serpent's eggs'¹² : men, too, who believed in a 'passible Godhead'.¹³ Cyril, in the

¹ Isidore, *Epp.* i. cccx (*Op.* 82 sq. ; *P. G.* lxxviii. 361), and Document No. 205.

² Ibid. cccxi (*Op.* 83 ; *P. G.* lxxviii. 361-4) ; Fleury, xxvi. v.

³ Cyril, *Op.* ix. 145-57 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 293-312) ; *Coll. post Eph.*, c. i (Mansi, v. 1-19).

⁴ See their commission in *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. xxii (Mansi, iv. 1457-60) ; Fleury, xxvi. viii, and the 'Relatio' of the Synod in c. xxiii (1460 c, d).

⁵ Their commission in Mansi, iv. 1399-1402 ; Fleury, xxvi.

⁶ For a lively account of the intrigues and expectations of the moment, see Thdt. *Ep.* clxix (*Op.* iv. 1345-7 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1475 sq.) ; Mansi, iv. 147 sq. ; Fleury, xxvi. ix.

⁷ *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, c. xxv (Mansi, iv. 1465 sq.) ; Fleury, xxvi. x.

⁸ *Synodicon*, cc. xxiv-xxvi (Mansi, v. 792-4).

⁹ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxxv.

¹⁰ Sixtus III, *Ep.* vi, § 7 (*P. L.* l. 609 c) ; Mansi, v. 380 B ; Jaffé, No. 392.

¹¹ *Synodicon*, c. xxxi (Mansi, v. 802 B).

¹² Mansi, iv. 1409 B.

¹³ Ibid. 1410 B.

meanwhile, took 'French leave', and returned to Alexandria in triumph,¹ 30 October 431. So ended, in dissension, the Council of Ephesus. It is a painful story ; but the authority of a Council, however unworthy its proceedings, depends upon the subsequent acceptance of its decisions by the Church.

¹ *Collectio ad Eph.*, c. xiv (Mansi, v. 255 sq.).

CHAPTER XIII

REUNION : AND THE END OF NESTORIANISM WITHIN THE EMPIRE, 432-5

AFTER the Council of Ephesus there ensued eighteen months of unsettlement.

I

The question, at this period, was to find a *modus vivendi* for Reunion between Cyril and John ; and this was done between 431-3.

§ 1. For the moment, things grew worse, both at Constantinople and in Asia. At Constantinople there was a party of Nestorians created by the deposition of Nestorius, as there had been of Joannites upon the deprivation of Chrysostom ; notable among them Dorotheus, bishop of Marcianopolis, 430-4, and metropolitan of Moesia Inferior. Maximian, backed by the Government, determined to make short work with them ; and in a Synod at Constantinople, supported by Juvenal, the two papal legates and others who were still ' in town ',¹ he deposed not only Dorotheus, but three other metropolitans of similar sympathies : Himerius of Nicomedia in Bithynia I, Eutherius of Tyana in Cappadocia II, and the ascetic Helladius of Tarsus in Cilicia I. Maximian was stretching a point to claim authority over prelates of Asia² : he had none at all over Tarsus, which belonged to the Patriarchate of Antioch. This invasion of the rights of John could never have taken place but for the breach between Constantinople and the Orientals. The latter, as they travelled from Ephesus eastwards, were treated by the bishops of Ancyra and Caesarea as excommunicated. They retaliated by stopping at Tarsus³ to renew their condemnation of Cyril, with five of his envoys at Chalcedon ; and, once more at home in their dioceses, they treated Nestorius as unjustly deposed and Cyril as a heretic and author of all the

¹ For the bishops present, see their Synodal Letter in *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xv (Mansi, v. 257) ; and, for the depositions, *Synodicon*, cc. xlv, xlviii, xlix, lxx, lxxi (Mansi, v. 822 sq.).

² For the final inclusion of Pontus and Asia in the Patriarchate of CP., see *Chalc.* c. 28, W. Bright, *Canons* ², xlvii. 222.

³ *Synodicon*, cc. lxvi, cxxxvi, cxli, clxxiv (Mansi, v. 843, 917, 920, 953).

mischief. But some of the Orientals were beginning to think better of Cyril. John himself was never extreme, and his inclination to relent was anticipated, early in 432, by the action of one of the most influential of his colleagues, Rabbûla,¹ bishop of Edessa 412-†35, and metropolitan of Osrhoëne. Rabbûla was governor of Chalcis, in that province, when he was converted,² owing, in part, to the preaching of Alexander, founder of the Acoemetæ. He was a man of fiery and imperious temper, a monk, and a great missionary. He had now held, for nearly twenty years, the see of the capital of Mesopotamia; and was by force of character as well as in virtue of that great position, the leading prelate of the far East. Edessa had great prestige in Christian history.³ The influence of any of its bishops would have been great. But when Rabbûla, who had voted at Ephesus for the deposition of Cyril,⁴ anathematized Theodore 'as well as what we [Antiochenes] have taught', this was to declare war upon his former friends and to detach a great name from their side. Andrew, bishop of Samosata 431-4, in a letter to his metropolitan, Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis [Mabug] 431-4, in Augusta Euphratensis, took up the controversy against him, about March 432, on behalf of himself and Theodoret.⁵ Cyril, meanwhile, unaware perhaps as yet of the movements in his favour among the Orientals, was nevertheless conscious of the need of making good his reputation at Court. In reply to Maximian, who had written to tell him of his accession,⁶ Cyril compared him to Eliakim succeeding Shebna,⁷ and took occasion to disclaim any notion of 'alteration' or 'confusion' in the Divine Word⁸ which he had so often been accused of maintaining; while he addressed himself to the Emperor in his *Apologeticus ad Theodosium*,⁹ as if to counteract the effect of his imprudence in having,

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 504 sqq.; Fleury, xxvi. xvi.

² Fleury, xxv. xxvii.

³ F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 6 sqq., for the founding of Edessa; and, for the theology of Rabbûla, *ibid.* 110 sqq.

⁴ His name occurs among the signatories of the letters addressed by the Orientals (1) to clergy and laity of Hierapolis, *Synodicon*, c. xiii (Mansi, v. 776 B), and (2) to their deputies at C. P., *ibid.*, c. xxviii (Mansi, v. 797 B).

⁵ *Synodicon*, c. xliii (Mansi, v. 821). The Antiochenes thereupon warned the suffragans of Rabbûla against him, *ibid.*, c. xlv (Mansi, v. 822 A, B).

⁶ Cyril, *Ep.* xxx (*Op.* x. 94 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 147-50) = *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xvii (Mansi, v. 257-60). ⁷ *Ep.* xxxi. (*Op.* x. 98; *P. G.* lxxvii. 155).

⁸ *Ibid.* (*Op.* x. 96; *P. G.* lxxvii. 152 B); *Ep.* xxxi = *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xviii (Mansi, v. 259-66).

⁹ *Op.* ix. 241-60 (*P. G.* lxxvi. 453-88) = *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xiii (Mansi, v. 225-56).

on an earlier occasion, solicited the attention of the Imperial ladies. The *Apology* had the desired effect ; and the Court, after inclining at first to summon John and Cyril to come and confer in the Imperial presence at Nicomedia, fell back upon the plan of trying to induce the Orientals to abandon Nestorius, and Cyril to drop his Twelve Articles.¹ Letters to this effect were written in April 432 by the Emperor to John,² to Acacius, bishop of Beroea³ who, as the oldest of his colleagues might be expected to have the most weight with him, and to the celebrated St. Simeon Stylites⁴ whom nobody—Patriarch or Emperor—could ignore ; and the business was entrusted to Aristolaus, a tribune and notary, by whom the letters were sent.⁵

The mission of Aristolaus took him, first, to Antioch, and thence, to Alexandria ; supported by Paul, bishop of Emesa (Homs), the envoy of John.

§ 2. At Antioch, John was alarmed and suspected an intrigue. In a letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, he summoned him, along with his suffragan, Theodoret, and other friends, to come and advise him.⁶ They answered the summons ; and John held a Synod at Antioch consisting of Acacius, Alexander, and his two suffragans, Andrew of Samosata and Theodoret of Cyrus. They were urgent, at once, as Aristolaus would find, for the dropping of the Twelve Anathematisms. For they drew up six propositions, probably framed by John's chief theological adviser, Theodoret, of which the first is the most important, viz. that the Creed of Nicaea be taken as the sole authority ; all explanations, such as were given in the letters and the articles of Cyril being put away, and only that explanation being accepted which Athanasius had written, c. 370, to Epictetus of Corinth against the Apollinarians.⁷ On this condition they would receive any one into communion, and so close the question of doctrine. They shelved the personal question, whether or no Nestorius should be treated as deposed. We learn from a letter of Alexander and his two suffragans to Helladius of

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 515 sq. ; Fleury, xxvi. xvii.

² *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xxiv (Mansi, v. 277–82, 663–6).

³ *Ibid.*, c. xxv (Mansi, v. 283) = *Synodicon*, li (Mansi, v. 828).

⁴ *Ibid.*, c. xxvi (M. v. 284) = *Syn.* lii (M. v. 828 sq.).

⁵ For this version see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 372, n. 2.

⁶ *Synodicon*, c. l (Mansi, v. 827) ; Fleury, xxvi. xvii.

⁷ *Ibid.*, c. liii (Mansi, v. 829 c, d) ; Fleury, xxvi. xvii ; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 387 (E. Tr. iii. 121). The first of the six propositions is the only one now extant : see it in Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 162 n.

Tarsus that these terms were to be placed before Cyril¹: they were forwarded to him in a letter from Acacius of Beroea, which was taken by Aristolaus.² Cyril replied that he could not withdraw what he had written against Nestorius, but that it would be easy to come to an understanding about the Twelve Articles, if only the Orientals would accept the deposition of Nestorius. The Articles are only directed against the tenets of Nestorius; and, for himself, he disavowed once more the opposite errors so freely attributed to him.³ The letter, though firm, was conciliatory. It opened the way to reconciliation between Cyril and John; and, for immediate effect, it revealed at once the differences then coming to a head among the Antiochene party. There were now four sections among them, representing four shades of anti-Cyrrilline feeling. Thus (1) John himself, who now declared that his brother Patriarch had cleared his reputation. He was anxious for further negotiations; and had with him the venerable Acacius⁴ and the majority. Then there was (2) John's theological expert, Theodoret; he now expressed himself as satisfied with Cyril's later language on the ground that it cancelled his earlier⁵; but he would not consent to the deposition and indiscriminate condemnation of Nestorius.⁶ These two sections of the party had separated the doctrinal from the personal question: a great step on the road to peace. Third, stood (3) Andrew of Samosata, rather by himself. His tone was, 'We must go half way to meet Cyril now: though we are sorry to have to do it.' He was trying to separate the question of doctrine from the personal question, and he so far agreed with his metropolitan Alexander that he believed Cyril was still in error⁷; but he also believed with his comprovincial, Theodoret, that the time had come for leniency of construction in the interests of peace.⁸ A fourth element, led by (4) Alexander of Hierapolis, could not, or would not, keep the doctrinal and the personal question apart at any price. He scouted all terms with 'the Egyptian'⁹; and with him were three other

¹ *Synodicon*, c. liv (Mansi, v. 830).

² *Ibid.*, cc. liii, lv (Mansi, v. 829 c, 830 d).

³ *Ep.* xxxiii (*Op.* x. 99; *P. G.* lxxvii. 157-62); *Synodicon*, c. lvi (Mansi, v. 831-5); Fleury, xxvi. xviii.

⁴ *Synodicon*, c. lv (Mansi, v. 830 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, c. lx (Mansi, v. 840 B).

⁶ *Ibid.*, c. lxi (Mansi, v. 840 sq.).

⁷ *Ibid.*, c. lix (Mansi, v. 839 sq.).

⁸ 'Condescensione opus est,' *ib.*, cc. lxii, lxiii (Mansi, v. 841 sq.).

⁹ *Ibid.*, cc. lxiv, lxv (Mansi, v. 842 sq.).

metropolitans—Eutherius of Tyana,¹ Helladius of Tarsus,² and Maximin of Anazarbus.³ The two last were of Cilicia; and with them the influence of Theodore would count heavily. These were a tenacious minority; but a minority only of four. John and Acacius determined to ignore them; after John had tried,⁴ though without success,⁵ to soften Alexander and get him to take a kindlier view of Cyril. They selected as their envoy, Paul, bishop of Emesa, who had served as proxy for the aged Acacius on the commission sent by the Orientals at Ephesus to represent them at Constantinople⁶; and they sent him,⁷ in the autumn of 432, to second the mission of Aristolaus, the Imperial Commissioner.

§ 3. At Alexandria Cyril had been doing all in his power to counteract the influence which the Orientals exerted at Court. Maximian, of course, was on his side so far as to secure his own tenure by making a point of the deposition of Nestorius; but he had no feelings of fatherly affection, like Cyril, for the Twelve Articles.⁸ Their author still held that it was vital to retain them; and he set in motion every influence he could command in their favour.⁹ The holy monks Dalmatius and Eutyches, the priests Philip and Claudian, the archbishop Maximian himself, all these he levelled at Pulcheria, whom also he tried to move through her maids of honour, the *cubiculariae* Marcella and Droseria. They received handsome *eulogiae*¹⁰ or bribes; and so did important eunuchs; above all, the Grand Chamberlain, Chrysoretos. He was devoted to the cause of the Orientals, but, 'that he may cease to attack us', Cyril directed that he should be bought with 'six large Turkey-carpets and four of moderate size; four large carpets; eight couches; six table-cloths; large curtains; six carpets; six curtains of moderate size; six bench-covers; twelve cushions; four large tapestries; four benches, in ivory; six, in leather; four large pictures; six ostriches; and, if he

¹ *Synodicon*, cc. lxxiii, lxxiv (Mansi, v. 850-3).

² *Ibid.*, c. lxxviii (Mansi, v. 845).

³ *Ibid.*, c. lxxvii (Mansi, v. 844).

⁴ *Ibid.*, c. lxxvi (Mansi, v. 853-5).

⁵ *Ibid.*, cc. lxxvii, cxxxvi (Mansi, v. 855, 916).

⁶ *Ibid.*, c. lv (Mansi, v. 831 B: see also iv. 1400).

⁷ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 527 sqq.; Fleury, xxvi. xix.

⁸ Liberatus, *Breviarium* [written c. 560-6], § 8 (*P. L.* lxxviii. 983 A, B).

⁹ *Synodicon*, c. cciii (Mansi, v. 987-9). On this bribery, note the characteristic remarks of Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 541; Gibbon, c. xlvii (v. 118); Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 342 (ed. 1899). 'It does not answer', he says, 'to call whity-brown white,' i. e. all a Saint's actions saintly; and W. Bright, *Waymarks*, 161 sqq.

¹⁰ Cf. 4 Kings v. 15 [LXX]; R.V. 'present' [2 Kings v. 15].

does as instructed by the Most Magnificent Aristolaus and assists us, through the good offices of Claudian, two hundred pounds in gold'.¹ Cyril was a masterful man and stuck at nothing; he ran the church of Alexandria into debt to the amount of £60,000² in order to support this corruption; and it is probable that both the goodwill of John and Acacius as well as the conciliatoriness of their emissary Paul owed something to the success of the carnal weapons with which Cyril had won over the Court. In any case, Paul did his errand well. He was a man of years and experience; and arrived in Egypt about the winter of 432 armed with important documents. He brought with him (1) the six propositions of the recent Synod at Antioch; (2) the doctrinal formulary³ drawn up by Theodoret and presented to the Emperor, through Count John, on behalf of the Orientals. It now had its anti-Cyrrilline prelude⁴ and peroration⁵ cut out, and contained an introduction⁶ and a creed⁷—afterwards the *Formulary of Reunion* or *The Reunion Creed of the Antiochenes*. Finally, he carried (3) a letter of introduction from John to Cyril,⁸ which may be described as even cordial. John traces the troubles to the unfortunate Twelve Articles,⁹ and says that Cyril had promised further explanations.¹⁰ Will he make them? Not a word, however, about the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril was ill when Paul presented himself; and was not propitiated¹¹ by his letters of introduction from John. He noticed at once that nothing was said about the deposition of Nestorius. 'Would Paul assent to it?' 'Yes, readily.' 'But would John?' Paul thought he would; and forthwith placed in the hands of Cyril a written statement,¹² which settled all differences both as to the doctrinal,

¹ This list of bribes is given in a document preserved in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, i. ii. 47.

² Newman's note in Fleury, iii. 161, note e; Gibbon, xlvii (v. 118).

³ *Synodicon*, c. xvii (Mansi, v. 781-4).

⁴ 'Aegyptio mundum consuete turbante,' ib. (782 A).

⁵ 'Morbo qui illatus est Aegyptiacis capitulis,' ib. (783 D).

⁶ i. e. in a letter of John to Cyril: *περὶ δὲ τῆς Θεοτόκου*, κτλ., Cyril, *Ep.* xxxviii (*Op.* x. 103; *P. G.* lxxvii. 172 B) = *Conc. Eph.* III. xxix (Mansi, v. 291 A).

⁷ 'Ὁμολογοῦμεν, κτλ.,' ibid. (*Op.* x. 103; *P. G.* lxxvii. 172 C) = *Conc. Eph.* III. xxix (Mansi, v. 291 B).

⁸ *Synodicon*, c. lxxx (Mansi, v. 856 sqq.); Fleury, xxvi. xix; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 253 (E. Tr. iii. 128).

⁹ Ibid., c. lxxx (Mansi, v. 857 B).

¹⁰ Ibid. (857 C).

¹¹ Cyril, *Epp.* xl, xlviii (*Op.* x. 111, 156 B; *P. G.* lxxvii. 185 B, 252 A, B); *Conc. Eph.* III. cc. xxxv, xxxviii (Mansi, v. 312 E, 349 B).

¹² Cyril, *Ep.* xxxvi (*Op.* x. 100 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 165 sqq.) = *Conc. Eph.* III. c. xxviii (Mansi, v. 287 sqq.); Fleury, xxvi. xix.

and as to the personal, question. The statement was in a letter from Paul to Cyril. In pursuance, he says, of the Emperor's orders, John and Acacius had sent him to Alexandria; he had found Cyril disposed to peace, and had received from him a paper in which the Catholic Faith was set down in its pristine purity. The reference here is, no doubt, to the *Formulary of Reunion* as accepted and made his own by Cyril; and 'this', says Paul, 'was worth any trouble'. Thus the doctrinal difference was settled; and 'because it is necessary', continues Paul, 'that the personal matter about Nestorius should be settled too, I declare that we receive the ordination of Maximian; we look upon Nestorius as deposed; we embrace your communion, on the basis of our joint-acceptance of the formulary just mentioned, and appended to this letter; the schism is at an end'. Paul, at first, had wanted to insist on the restoration of the four Nestorianizing metropolitans deposed by Maximian; but on this point Cyril was inflexible,¹ and Paul thought it well to acknowledge Maximian without pressing the point. Peace was thus made; he was received into the communion of the church of Alexandria² 18 December 432, and on Christmas Day admitted to preach,³ as a Catholic bishop. 'Mary, the mother of God', he exclaimed, 'brought forth Emmanuel.' 'Ah! that's the Faith,' shouted his audience: 'It is the gift of God! O orthodox Cyril!' addressing themselves to their Patriarch as he sat listening from his throne. 'This is what we wanted to hear! Anathema to him who speaks not thus!'⁴ Paul proceeded to expound the result of the Incarnation. 'The concurrence of the two complete Natures (φύσεις) has formed for us the one only Son, the one only Christ, the one only Lord.' Again he was cheered to the echo: 'Welcome, orthodox bishop! Worthy of Cyril! Gift of God!'⁵ On New Year's Day, 433, Paul preached again⁶; and whereas, before, he had emphasized the truth for which Cyril had all along contended—'One only Person in Christ, and *that* Divine'—now he stood firm for the complementary truth so persistently championed by Theodoret—'two distinct Natures, divine *and*

¹ Cyril, *Ep.* xlviii (*Op.* x. 157; *P. G.* lxxvii. 252 D) = *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xxxviii (Mansi, v. 349 D, E).

² Cyril, *Ep.* xxxvii (*Op.* x. 101; *P. G.* lxxvii. 169 A).

³ *Homilia Pauli*, ap. *Conc. Eph.* III. xxxi (Mansi, v. 293-6); Fleury, xxvi. xix. ⁴ *Ibid.* (293 D). ⁵ *Ibid.* (293 E).

⁶ *Eiusdem Pauli Homilia*, ap. *Conc. Eph.* III. xxxii (Mansi, v. 295-302).

human'. 'Emmanuel,' he said, 'whom the Virgin Mother brought forth for us, is, indeed, according to His Divine Nature consubstantial with the Father; but He is also, according to His human nature, consubstantial with us.'¹ There was applause again²; and Cyril assented. Thus the first step in the Reunion of Alexandria and Antioch was publicly taken; its accomplishment now turned on the question whether John and his friends would confirm the acts of their emissary Paul.

§ 4. Returning to Antioch, Aristolaus and Paul, accompanied by two Alexandrian clergy, Cassius and Ammon, presented to John a document for him to sign, in accordance with the agreement between Paul and Cyril. He yielded at once to the doctrinal affirmation required of him; and, under pressure from Aristolaus, he consented to abandon Nestorius³ and accept Maximian in his stead. The decision he announced in a circular letter to his three brother Patriarchs,⁴ Sixtus III of Rome, 432-†40, Maximian of Constantinople, 431-†4, and Cyril of Alexandria, 412-†44; and he added two cordial letters to Cyril alone.⁵ In a short sermon⁶ of 23 April, Cyril made known the joyful news to his people; and, on the same day, replied to John with the celebrated letter *Laetentur coeli*,⁷ a document of oecumenical authority inasmuch as it was expressly and solemnly approved at the Council of Chalcedon.⁸ After an introduction on the happiness of peace and the visit of Paul of Emesa, Cyril observes it is now clear that dissension was needless.⁹ 'Paul has brought me a paper drawn up by your Holiness, which I am inserting in this letter word for word'—and then follows the *Formulary of Reunion*,¹⁰ which Cyril thus makes his own. The Creed of Nicaea is sufficient; yet, by way of giving full expression to our belief, we acknowledge

¹ *Eiusdem Pauli Homilia*, ap. *Conc. Eph.* III. xxxii (297 A).

² *Ibid.* (301 B).

³ *Ep.* xxxvii (*Op.* x. 401; *P. G.* lxxvii. 169 B).

⁴ *Conc. Eph.* III. xxvii (Mansi, v. 285); Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 400 sq. (E. Tr. iii. 135): see also Cyril, *Ep.* xlviii (*Op.* x. 157; *P. G.* lxxvii. 253 A).

⁵ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxviii (*Op.* x. 102-4; *P. G.* lxxvii. 169-71) = *Conc. Eph.* III. xxx (Mansi, v. 289-92); Fleury, xxvi. xxi; and Cyril, *Ep.* xlvii (*Op.* x. 146-55; *P. G.* lxxvii. 247-50). Both summarized in Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 401 sq. (E. Tr. iii. 136).

⁶ *Conc. Eph.* III. xxix (Mansi, v. 289 sq.).

⁷ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxix (*Op.* x. 104-9; *P. G.* lxxvii. 173-82) = *Conc. Eph.* III. xxxiii (Mansi, v. 301-10); Fleury, xxvi. xxi; Bindley, *Oec. Doc.*, and Document No. 195.

⁸ At *Session II*, of 10 October 451 (Mansi, vi. 960 B, C).

⁹ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxix (*Op.* x. 105; *P. G.* lxxvii. 176 B).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* (176 C-177 B).

Jesus Christ to be not complete God only but complete Man as well, of a rational soul and a body.¹ If He is consubstantial with the Father as touching His Godhead, He is also consubstantial with us as touching His manhood.² There is an Unity of Person³; but also a distinction of Natures, as the Gospel sayings imply.⁴ So far the *Formulary*; and, in making its language his own, Cyril, point by point, lays a new stress on the reality of our Lord's manhood, and so balances such language of his Twelve Anathematisms as had been thought to ignore or even to deny it. He then disclaims, once more, the imputation of Apollinarianism. 'I am accused of saying that the flesh of Christ came down from heaven⁵: but this is excluded by my insistence upon *Theotokos*.' We say, of course, with St. Paul, that 'the Second Man is from heaven'⁶; or, with St. John, that 'the Son of Man came down from heaven'⁷; but that is because He is one with His own flesh which was born of the holy Virgin.⁸ If, again, I am accused of teaching a mixture, confusion, or blending⁹ of God with flesh, the charge is refuted, as your Holiness, I am sure, will allow, by my repeated insistence on the continuity of Christ's Person, coupled with the fact that, while impassible in His Godhead, He took upon Him our sufferings by economically, i. e. in accordance with the mystery of the Incarnation, appropriating to Himself the sufferings proper to His own flesh.¹⁰ In so saying, I am but repeating the language of my predecessor, Athanasius, in his *Letter to Epictetus*; of which I have the pleasure to enclose a correct copy.¹¹ One question only this letter of Cyril to John shelved—the withdrawal of the Twelve Articles. But John did not drag it out to light, and the Reunion was thus happily accomplished.

II

The effects¹² of the Reunion have next to be considered.

§ 5. And, first, upon the Orientals. John informed them of the peace, first in a letter to Theodoret,¹³ and then in an encyclical.¹⁴

¹ Cyril, *Ep.* xxxix (177 sq.).

² Ibid. (177 A).

³ Ibid. (177 A).

⁴ Ibid. (177 B).

⁵ Ibid. (177 c).

⁶ Ibid. (180 A); 1 Cor. xv. 47

⁷ Ibid. (180 A); John iii. 13.

⁸ Ibid. (180 A); on this *Communicatio Idiomatum* see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo* ², 128 sqq.

⁹ Κρᾶσις, σύγχυσις, φύρμος (Mansi, v. 180 B).

¹⁰ Ibid. (180 B).

¹¹ Ibid. (181 B).

¹² Fleury, xxvi. xxii.

¹³ *Synodicon*, c. lxxxvi (Mansi, v. 867 sq.).

¹⁴ Ibid., c. ii (Mansi, v. 751 sq.).

(1) As to Theodoret, John had grounds for anxiety. Theodoret was suspicious,¹ and would say that the Twelve Articles ought to have been withdrawn; though he did not blame the union in doctrine and so recognized implicitly the orthodoxy of Cyril. 'He has retracted and has overthrown his Twelve Articles' is the burden of two of his letters about Cyril at this time.² But he would not consent to the deposition of Nestorius and his friends.³ The bishop of Cýrús thus stood midway between his Patriarch John and extremists such as Alexander, his metropolitan, who now refused either to condemn Nestorius or to communicate with Cyril,⁴ and even renounced communion with John.⁵ Andrew of Samosata was at one with Theodoret in accepting Cyril's later language; and went farther than he in thinking that it was necessary to make peace,⁶ though he agreed that Nestorius must not be deposed. Theodoret and his friends were thus approximating to the majority of the Easterns in favour of peace. At the Synod of Zeugma,⁷ in Syria Euphratensis, Theodoret,⁸ Andrew,⁹ and John of Germanicia,¹⁰ all suffragans of that province, acknowledged the orthodoxy of Cyril; but not the deposition of Nestorius.

(2) Their metropolitan, Alexander of Hierapolis, was furious with these *quondam* allies, and quite impracticable. He renounced their communion,¹¹ as well as that of John,¹² in angry letters. Deserted by his comprovincials in Syria, he threw himself upon the support of his friends in Cilicia, where traditions of the theology of Theodore would still be strong. Here he and his party proceeded to hold a little Synod of their own, under Maximin, at Anazarbus in Cilicia II, in which they excommunicated Cyril and withdrew both from his communion and from that of Antioch.¹³ And two of them, Eutherius of Tyana and Helladius of Tarsus, went so far as to write to Pope Sixtus III, asking for his co-operation against the Reunion.¹⁴ They must have lost their heads!

¹ *Synodicon*, c. lxxxvii (Mansi, v. 868 sq.) in reply to John.

² *Ibid.*, cc. lxxxviii, xcv (Mansi, v. 869 sq., 876-8).

³ *Ibid.*, c. lxxxvii (Mansi, v. 868 E) and c. cxx (Mansi, v. 898 sq.).

⁴ *Ibid.*, cc. xevi, c, civ (Mansi, v. 878 sq., 881 sq., 884 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, cc. xciii, xciv (Mansi, v. 874 sq.); Fleury, xxvi. xxvi.

⁶ *Ibid.*, cc. ci, ciii (Mansi, v. 882 sq., 884).

⁷ *Ibid.*, cc. xevii-xcxix (Mansi, v. 879 sq.); Fleury, xxvi. xxvi.

⁸ *Ibid.*, c. cxxii (Mansi, v. 903 sq.).

⁹ *Ibid.*, c. cvi (885 sq.).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, cc. civ, cix (885, 888). Germanicia was the birthplace of Nestorius.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, c. civ (884 sq.).

¹² *Ibid.*, c. cxxxvi (v. 916 sq.).

¹³ *Ibid.*, cc. cxi-cxiv (889-91); Fleury, xxvi. xxvi.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, c. cxvii (893-7).

About this time Maximian of Constantinople died,¹ on 12 April 434. He was succeeded by Proclus, 434–†46. There was no election: for to avoid tumults, as on previous vacancies, Theodosius II simply commanded Proclus to be enthroned.² John was informed of the appointment by Taurus, the Praetorian Prefect. 'If only', replied John, 'you would think of restoring tranquillity to these parts too.' He was dissatisfied with both sides, and particularly with 'the unruly spirits' in his Patriarchate.³ At last he obtained an Imperial Rescript to the effect that all the bishops of 'The East' must enter into communion with their Patriarch or leave their sees.⁴ Andrew had quitted the middle party before this, and had come into full communion with John, through the influence of Rabbûla.⁵ Theodoret at length came in, after an interview with John in which the Patriarch had waived the point of subscription to the deposition of Nestorius.⁶ So also did Maximin and his fellows of Cilicia II; Helladius of Tarsus and his colleagues of Cilicia I. But a letter of Helladius⁷ to Nestorius shows that his mind remained unchanged, and evinces the folly of persecution in religion. Alexander of Hierapolis stood out obdurately.⁸ Along with seventeen other irreconcilables he was deposed April 435, and banished to the Egyptian mines.⁹ And thus the Reunion triumphed in 'The East'; but under pressure.

§ 6. It rallied the Easterns; but on the friends of Cyril its effect was disintegrating. They began to ask themselves whether his acceptance of Two Natures in Christ were not a deviation from strict orthodoxy.

Thus, in Egypt, Isidore¹⁰ of Pelusium, †440, who had formerly taxed his Patriarch with pressing the Nestorianizers too hard,¹¹ now blamed him for making terms too easily.¹²

We may mention here two other letters of Isidore, as of special interest, referring to the doctrine of Baptism. It is not only for forgiveness of sins, to purify men's souls from the stain contracted

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xl, § 1.

² Ibid., §§ 3, 4; on Proclus, see ib. xli; Fleury, xxvi. xxvii.

³ *Synodicon*, c. cxxiii (Mansi, v. 904); Fleury, xxvi. xxviii.

⁴ Ibid., cc. cxl, cxlii, cxliii, cxlvi (920, 922 sq., 923, 925); Fleury, xxvi. xxxi.

⁵ Ibid., cc. xcviii, cvi (880, 885 sq.).

⁶ Ibid., cc. clx, clxii (938, 940).

⁷ Ibid., c. xciii (967 sq.).

⁸ Fleury, xxvi. xxxii–xxxiv.

⁹ *Synodicon*, cc. clxxiv–clxxxvii, cxc (951–66).

¹⁰ Fleury, xxvi. xxx.

¹¹ *Epp.* i. ccclxx (*Op.* 96 sq.; *P. G.* lxxviii. 392 c).

¹² *Epp.* i. cccxxiv (*Op.* 86; *P. G.* lxxviii. 369 c).

by Adam's sin,¹ but for a new birth; and both Baptism and the Eucharist (Baptism being at that time never administered, even to infants, without Communion²) necessary to salvation.³

But to return to the suspicions of Cyril entertained by his friends.⁴ At Constantinople they were asking, 'Why did Cyril sanction the Two Natures? The Nestorians are now saying, "He has come over to us", and, in consequence, are kidnapping all who know no better'.⁵ So we are informed in Cyril's letter to his envoy at the capital, the priest Eulogius; and he also had to assure Donatus, bishop of Nicopolis 425-32, and metropolitan of Epirus Vetus, that he had not gone back upon his former writings against Nestorius.⁶

On the upper waters of the Euphrates, Cyril's old friend, Acacius, bishop of Melitene 431-8, and metropolitan of Armenia II, signified that some uneasiness was felt at his part in the *concordat*. This drew from Cyril a protest⁷ that the exposition of the Faith which he had received from the Orientals differed widely from the doctrine of Nestorius. The latter, he explained, asserted two Christs, the *Formulary of Reunion* but one; and, by way of emphasizing this doctrine of one Christ, he made use of an expression which afterwards had disastrous consequences, because of its ambiguity. 'We believe,' he said, 'the nature (φύσις) of the Son to be one, but of One who became man and was incarnate'⁸: or, as he expressed it to Eulogius, 'One incarnate nature of God'—Μίαν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην. Cyril had already, in the *De recta fide*, addressed to the princesses Arcadia and Marina, adopted the phrase, 'One incarnate nature of God the Word'⁹—Μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην—citing it as if from Athana-

¹ *Epp.* III. cxcv (*Op.* 333; *P. G.* lxxviii. 880 B).

² *Ibid.* (*Op.* 333; *P. G.* lxxviii. 880 C).

³ He quotes the two 'Excepts', &c., of John iii. 5, v. 53; *Epp.* II. lii (*Op.* 144 sq.; *P. G.* lxxviii. 496).

⁴ Fleury, xxvi. xxix.

⁵ Cyril, *Ep.* xlv (*Op.* x. 132; *P. G.* lxxvii. 225 A)=*Conc. Eph.* III, c. xxxvii (Mansi, v. 344 C, D).

⁶ *Ep.* xlviii (*Op.* x. 155-7; *P. G.* lxxvii. 249-54)=*Conc. Eph.* III, c. xxxviii (Mansi, v. 347-51).

⁷ *Ep.* xl (*Op.* x. 109-20; *P. G.* lxxvii. 181-202)=*Conc. Eph.* III, c. xxxv (Mansi, v. 309-26).

⁸ Μίαν εἶναι πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ Υἱοῦ φύσιν, ὡς ἐνός, πλὴν ἐνανθρωπήσαντος καὶ σεσαρκωμένου, *Ep.* xl (*Op.* x. 115; *P. G.* lxxvii. 192 sq.); Mansi, v. 320 A.

⁹ *De rect. fid. ad Reginas*, i, § 9 (*Op.* ix. 48; *P. G.* lxxvi. 1212 A): see also *Adv. Nest.* ii, praef. (*Op.* ix. 31; *P. G.* xxvi. 60 D), and the note *ad loc.* in *L. F.* xlvii. 41, note c. On the phrase, see J. H. Newman, *Tracts theol. and eccl.* 329-82 (ed. 1899); and, on this episode, W. Bright, *Later Tr. of St. Ath.* 174 sq.

sus. But the short confession, *De incarnatione Dei Verbi*,¹ from which the citation is made, is not a genuine work of Athanasius. Supposing, however, that his successor quoted it under the impression that it had such high authority, and was now twitted by his old friends with having admitted the contrary, Cyril gave explanations enough in letters to Eulogius,² Acacius,³ Succensus,⁴ bishop of Diocaesarea in Isauria, which show⁵ that the one idea in his mind was to guard the undivided union of two natures in One Being. We are not to think of God and a man in Jesus Christ; but of the God-man. Yet, for all that, the phrase was unfortunate. Φύσις was ambiguous. As yet, it more often meant Nature than Person. If quoted apart from Cyril's explanations, as it would be and was by minds impatient of glosses, the phrase would lead to 'confusion' and to a denial of the Two Natures (φύσεις) in the One Divine Person (ὑπόστασις): whereas its author meant by it simply that in the Incarnate Son we must recognize not two beings but One only. It is this line that the Armenians still adopt when they speak of the 'One Nature'. 'They considered Byzantium to mean by "Two Natures" what Nestorius meant,' says Dr. Neale, 'by "Two Persons".'⁶ Tillemont thinks that the criticisms of the Easterns and their delay in condemning Nestorius had been overruled for good when they enabled Cyril to 'smother Monophysitism in advance'⁷ by such explanations as he now had occasion to offer of the phrase—'One Nature of the Word Incarnate'—by which it won its victories. But the phrase, despite all explanations, was potent for evil in that direction; and, while explanations did nothing to check the advance of Monophysitism, it is probable that greater willingness, could Cyril have shown it, to modify some of his Twelve Articles, would have prevented Nestorianism from spreading over so wide a field.

¹ Ath. *Op.* iv. 1 sq. (*P. G.* xxviii. 25-30); Bardenhewer, 255.

² *Ep.* xlv (*Op.* x. 132-5; *P. G.* lxxvii. 223-8); *Conc. Eph.* iii. xxxvii (Mansi, v. 343-8).

³ *Ep.* xl (*Op.* x. 109-20; *P. G.* lxxvii. 181-202); *Conc. Eph.* iii. xxxv (Mansi, v. 309-26).

⁴ *Epp.* xlv, xlv (*Op.* x. 135-46; *P. G.* lxxvii. 227-46), esp. xlv, § 3 (*Op.* x. 143 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 244 A), and W. Bright, *Later Tr. St. Ath.* 175, note f.

⁵ See also *Ep.* 1 (*Op.* x. 158-71; *P. G.* lxxvii. 253-78); *Conc. Eph.* iii. xl (Mansi, v. 353-72).

⁶ *Hist. Eastern Ch.* ii. 1080: see also A. Fortescue, *The lesser Eastern Churches*, 412; W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², 165; *Waymarks*, 399, n. 2.

⁷ *Mém.* xiv. 545.

III

Its extension was consequent upon the end of Nestorius and of Nestorianism within the Empire,¹ c. 435.

§ 7. Nestorius, since the Council of Ephesus, had been relegated to his former monastery at Antioch; and there, for four years, 431–5, he had lived in peace. But, by edicts of 2–3 August 435, Theodosius II decreed that his followers were to be called Simonians for ‘abandoning God’, as did Simon Magnus; and forbidden to retain the writings of their master or to meet for worship.² In a rescript of 436 Nestorius was banished to Petra in Arabia³; but he was sent, instead, to the Great Oasis (now the Oasis of Khargeh), on the borders of Upper Egypt; where we find him in 439 when Socrates finished his *History*.⁴ Thence he was carried captive by marauders to Panopolis (Akhmîm); thence removed to Elephantine opposite to Syene (Assuan); and thence again he was to have been sent to a fourth place of exile. Coincidentally with his exile, there passed into exile his friend the Count Irenaeus,⁵ afterwards bishop of Tyre, c. 447–8, and metropolitan of Phoenicia. Irenaeus occupied himself in compiling in Greek an account and a *dossier* of the late troubles, called his *Tragoedia*. It survives only in a series of extracts—very considerable, it is true—made after the death of Justinian, 527–†65, by a Latin cleric who defended the *Three Chapters*, and entitled the *Synodicon*.⁶ We have often referred to it, as a source for the affair of Nestorius. He also, during his wanderings, strove to re-establish his credit by the apology published under the title of the *Book of Heraclides*; and he lived on till the eve of the Council of Chalcedon which, though it did not decide in his favour, redressed the balance to some degree in his direction. At last, about June 451, he died, worn out by barbarities not unlike those which hastened the death of his predecessor, St. Chrysostom. They are recorded with a pitiful complacency by the Catholic historian, Evagrius⁷—

¹ Fleury, xxvi. xxxiv; Gibbon, c. xlvii (v. 119 sqq.); A. Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 65, 75 sqq.

² *Cod. Theod.* xvi. v. 66; *Conc. Eph.* iii. xlv (Mansi, v. 413 sq.).

³ *Conc. Eph.* iii, c. xv (Mansi, v. 255 sq.).

⁴ *Socr. H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 11; Fleury, xxvi. xxxiv (iii. 139, note x).

⁵ *Synodicon*, clxxxviii (Mansi, v. 964).

⁶ q.v. in Mansi, v. 731–1022, and Thdt. *Op.* v. 608–906 (*P. G.* lxxxiv. 551–864); and, for its history, Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 605 sq.; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 338, n. 2.

⁷ Evagrius, *H. E.* i, § 7 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. ii. 2433–44).

'a hard and stupid fanatic',¹ who wrote as the continuator of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, and carried the history on from 431 to 594—the end of his own time.²

§ 8. The followers of Nestorius, forbidden to be found in possession of his writings, were not to be baffled. Like Cyril, they knew where Nestorianism came from, viz. from Cilicia³; and bettered any profit to be derived from their distribution by circulating instead the works of Diodore and Theodore.⁴ In so doing they took a step which had important consequences on the doctrinal system: first, of the Church in Persia; and then, of the Church of the Empire.

§ 9. The Church in Persia,⁵ for nearly a century, had lived in fear of persecution or in safety, according as the Roman and the Persian Empire were at war or at peace.

By the treaty which Jovian had made in 363 on the defeat of Julian, the frontier was reconstituted; and while Edessa, the mother-city of the Christian religion in the far East, remained Roman, Nisibis, some hundred and fifty miles to the East, was given up to Persia. The Church in Persia thus gained a metropolitan see, and a theological school of no little importance. This was under Sapor II, 309–†79. His brother, Ardashir II, 379–†83, continued the persecution⁶; but after his death there set in, because both Empires were menaced by the White Huns, 395, an interval of peace and reorganization which lasted on into the reign of Iazdgerd I, 399–†420. The reorganization was effected at the Synod of Seleucia-Ctesiphon,⁷ 410, mainly by the efforts of the doctor-⁸ and diplomatist-prelate, Mâruthâ of Maiferkat,⁹ near Amida (Diabekr), who came, c. 408–9, in attendance on an ambassador from Theodosius II.¹⁰ About forty bishops were

¹ Gibbon, c. xlvii, n. 58 (v. 121).

² Bardenhewer, 554.

³ Meletius, successor to Theodore in the see of Mopsuestia, was the only prelate of Cilicia II to stand out after the reconciliation to John of Antioch of his metropolitan Maximin of Anazarbus and comprovincials: see *Synodicon*, cc. clxxiii–clxxv (Mansi, v. 951–5); Fleury, xxvi. xxxii.

⁴ Liberatus, *Breviarium*, § 10 (P. L. lxxviii. 990 A).

⁵ J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse* (1904); W. A. Wigram, *The Assyrian Church* (1910); A. Fortescue, *L. E. C.* (1913).

⁶ Labourt, 84.

⁷ Text of the decrees of the Synod in *Synodicon Orientale*, 253–75, ed. J. B. Chabot, in *Notices et extraits des MSS. de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, t. xxxvii (Paris, 1902); Labourt, 92–9; Wigram, 95–101.

⁸ Socr. *H. E.* vii. viii, § 6; Mâruthâ had taken part in the Synod of the Oak, *ibid.* vi. xv, § 10.

⁹ Martyropolis, a suffragan see of Edessa.

¹⁰ Socr. *H. E.* vii. viii, § 3; Labourt, 89.

present; and Mâruthâ brought letters from 'the Western Fathers', as a Christian of Persia would call them, i.e. from Porphyrius, bishop of Antioch 404-†13, the metropolitan of Edessa, and others. The Synod accepted the Creed and the decisions of Nicaea; western rules such as that there should be but 'one bishop in a Catholic church' and that each bishop should have not less than three consecrators; the observance of the Epiphany (i.e. Christmas and Epiphany, still one feast), Easter, Lent, and Good Friday, as elsewhere. It also formally assigned the primacy of the Persian Church to the bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon¹; and this prelate, as he had at Antioch a Patriarch over him and, in his own country, metropolitans (five in all—Bait Lapat, Nisibis, Prat d'Maishan, Karkar d'Bait Sluk, and Arbela) under him, began to look about for a title corresponding to this exalted but, as yet, ill-defined position. He found it in *Catholicus*. The title was originally a civil one; and was proper to the Imperial ministers of finance, whether for the 'Diocese' or for the Empire. 'I have ordered the *Catholicus* of Africa', wrote Constantine to Caecilian in 313, 'to count out three thousand pieces to your Holiness.'² It came to mean Procurator-General³; a high official who was really somebody else's deputy but, in practice, *the* authority on the spot, like the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford. In this sense it had been assumed by the Armenian Primate,⁴ when relations with the Exarch of Caesarea in Cappadocia, whence Armenia had, in part, been converted, were becoming uneasy. From Armenia the Christians in Persia borrowed it. *Catholicus* thus stood, in effect, for the next thing to Patriarch in days when it was assumed that Patriarchs were strictly limited in number.⁵ It was, in fact, a convenient description for the head of a Church so far removed, geographically or politically, from its mother-Church as to be practically independent.⁶ Four-

¹ Canons, i, vi, xviii.

² *Ap. Eus. H. E.* x. vi, § 1; so *καθολικότης* = the ministry of finance, *ibid.* viii. xi, § 1; and Macrianus, as minister of finance to Valerian, is said to have been *ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων*, *ibid.* vii. x, § 5.

³ J. M. Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 141.

⁴ A. Fortescue, *L. E. F.* 405.

⁵ The title only came to be finally and definitely applied to the five great sees by the Council of Chalcedon, 451, W. Bright, *Canons* 2, 104.

⁶ Fortescue insists that it meant 'vicar of a greater bishop' (*L. E. F.* 405). He is biassed by the papal theory of every bishop but one having an ecclesiastical superior, and superiors all running up ultimately to the Pope—'the central authority of Rome over the whole Church' (*ibid.*). But this was

teen years later, at the Synod of Markabta of the Arabs,¹ 424, the Persian Church proclaimed its independence—a claim that is best understood as a political move, taken not in a mere spirit of schism but in self-defence.

Toward the end of the reign of Iazdgerd, 399–†420, a Christian enthusiast burnt a fire-temple²; and persecution broke out afresh.³ It raged, with appalling fierceness, under his successor, Bahram V, 420–†38, and there were numberless martyrs as under Sapor II. The persecution synchronized, as usual, with a renewal of war, 421, between Rome and Persia⁴; and was mitigated⁵ by the peace of 422, in which Theodosius II granted toleration to Mazdeans in the Empire in return for like favours from Bahram V to Christians in Persia. Now, if it were once made plain to the Persian Court that Christians in Persia had nothing to do with their co-religionists west of the frontier, the loyalty of Persian Christians might cease to be suspect, and peace might be assured to a *national* Church. It is thus that we may best explain⁶ the declaration of its independence by the Church of Persia at the Synod of 424; and thus, too, was the ground prepared in Persia for a welcome to Nestorianism precisely because it was *not* the form of Christianity acknowledged by the Roman Empire.

No sooner, then, were the writings of Nestorius put under the ban, than those of his masters in theology, Diodore and Theodore were circulated instead. They were translated⁷ into Syriac by Ibas⁸ (Yihîbâ) a priest, and (on the death of Rabbûla) bishop,

a theory that was then only making its way. Wigram thinks that *Catholicus* meant Patriarch, i. e. that the *Catholicus* of Seleucia-Ctesiphon was the equal of the Patriarch of Antioch (*The Assyrian Church*, 91–2).

¹ *Synodicon Orientale*, 296; Labourt, 122 sqq.; Wigram, 123 sqq.; Fortescue, 50 sq., and Document No. 155.

² Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxix, § 1.

³ Labourt, 104–18; Wigram, 113–20. Socrates (*H. E.* vii. xviii, § 1) says that Iazdgerd I was no persecutor; but he must mean that he was not the author of a general persecution (Labourt, 109, n. 1) such as Bahram inaugurated. For this, see Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxix; Tillemont, *Mém.* xii. 356–63.

⁴ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xviii–xxi; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 40 sqq.; and Gibbon, c. xxxii (iii. 390 sq.).

⁵ Not brought to an end: see Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxix, § 5.

⁶ So Wigram, 125; but Duchesne thinks that it grew out of the necessity of strengthening the ecclesiastical organization on the spot, which would have been weakened by appeals to Antioch. It was the same feeling which impelled the Africans to forbid appeals from their jurisdiction to the Roman See, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 563 sq.

⁷ Fleury, xxvi. xxxvi (iii. 194 a).

⁸ Proclus, *Ep.* iii, § 2 (*P. G.* lxxv. 875 A).

of Edessa, 435–†57; into Armenian by Eulalius, a bishop of Persarmenia and friend of Theodoret to whom the latter wrote a letter of encouragement in the persecution¹; and into Persian by a correspondent to whom Ibas, now leader of the Nestorian party at Edessa, had recently written a letter,² 433, censuring the Council of Ephesus³; denouncing Cyril's Twelve Articles⁴; repudiating Rabbûla, bishop of Edessa, as a turncoat and a tyrant⁵; and describing the Reunion as a retractation of his errors by 'the Egyptian'.⁶ The recipient of the letters of Ibas is commonly known as Maris, bishop of Ardashir.⁷ But "Marî" means "My lord": and Ardashir is the Persian name for Seleucia-Ctesiphon.⁸ The letter may therefore have been addressed to no less a person than 'My lord bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon',⁹ i.e. to the *Catholicus* Dadyeshu, 421–†56. He may thus have had a share in making Nestorianism known throughout the Church of Persia. But Barsumas⁹ (Barsaumâ, b. 420–†92), Rector of the Persian School at Edessa, and participator with Ibas, his master, in the schism against their bishop Rabbûla, was the real propagator of Nestorianism in Persia. On the death of Ibas, bishop 435–49, and again 451–†7, of Edessa, there followed a strong Monophysite reaction under Nonnus, his successor, 457–†71. Barsumas and his comrades were 'either expelled, or voluntarily quitted a sphere that had ceased to be congenial'.¹⁰ They crossed the frontier, and most of them rose to high office in the Church of Persia. Barsumas, in particular, became metropolitan of Nisibis, the third see in the Church, and chief agent in making the Church of Persia Nestorian.

Thus Nestorianism, like Arianism fifty years previously, on its rejection from the Empire, took a fresh lease of life beyond its frontiers. But, whereas Arianism found acceptance with the barbarians because its Christ was as one of their demigods,

¹ Thdt. *Ep.* lxxvii (*Op.* iv. 1126 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1245 sqq.).

² Mansi, vii. 241–50; Fleury, xxvii; Hefele, iii. 366–8. The letter afterwards became the third of the famous 'Three Chapters', condemned by Justinian, 527–†65, to please the Monophysites.

³ Mansi, vii. 244 c.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid. 245 B.

⁶ Ibid. 248 B.

⁷ Fleury, xxvii. xxi (iii. 270, note m).

⁸ Labourt, 133, n. 6.

⁹ Labourt, c. vi; Wigram, c. viii. His name = 'son of fasting'.

¹⁰ Wigram, 150. We must distinguish this expulsion (which Duchesne prefers to date 449–50, *Hist. anc.* iii. 568, n. 1) from the final closing of the School of Edessa in 489 (Labourt, 138, n. 1). When it was closed, Barsumas established its professors and pupils in the school of Nisibis, which then became the well-spring of Nestorianism throughout the East, Labourt, 141; Wigram, 166 sq.

Nestorianism obtained a welcome on political grounds. It became the form of Christianity tolerated by the kings of Persia because it was the faith which had been rejected by their enemies the Romans. When the Church of the Empire became by the *Henoticon*¹ of 482 officially Monophysite, Barsumas, who had much influence with King Piroz, 457-†84, secured the royal protection for the Church in Persia by an assurance that it was separate from the Church of the Romans and by an official confession that its faith was Dyophysite²; and this assurance was confirmed at the Council held in 486, under the *Catholicus* Acacius, which defined the Creed³ of the Church in Persia. Thus both the independence and the Creed of the Church of Persia were established together; though its Liturgy⁴ was older, and underwent no such change. It was now no part of the Church of the Empire, but a national Church and, as such, free from persecution. We may deplore these tendencies both to schism and to heresy, but they were the price the Persian Church had to pay for keeping Christian at all.⁵

§ 10. The Church in the Empire included part of Armenia.⁶ Roman geographers divided Armenia into Lesser and Greater, West and East respectively of the Euphrates. Greater Armenia, after Theodosius I had surrendered four-fifths of it to the Persians,⁷ was practically coterminous with what was then known as Persarmenia. It was a Christian country, under its *Catholicus* who, c. 375, had separated from Caesarea in Cappadocia. He became the autonomous ruler of a national Church; and, as its sympathies were with the Christian Empire, Armenians were repeatedly persecuted by their overlords the Persians. Lesser Armenia belonged to the Empire. It contained two provinces: Armenia I, the metropolitan of which was the bishop of Sebaste; and Armenia II, whose metropolitan, at the time of the Council of Ephesus, was Acacius, bishop of Melitene 431-†8. Finding

¹ q. v. in Evagrius, *H. E.* iii, § 14 (*P. G.* LXXXVI. ii. 2619-26), and Document No. 235; summarized in Hefele, iii. 452 sqq. It was a document ostensibly orthodox, but really monophysite, its object being to conciliate the Monophysites.

² Labourt, 139; Wigram, 155.

³ q. v. in Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale*, 302; Wigram, 269; see Duchesne, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 568 sq., and Document No. 236.

⁴ q. v. in F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies*, i. 247 sqq.

⁵ Wigram, 156.

⁶ J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, v. 74 sqq.; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 522 sqq.; A. Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 383 sqq.

⁷ Gibbon places the division in the fifth century, c. xxxii (iii. 392); but see app. 25 (ed. Bury).

that the writings of Diodore and Theodore were being circulated, apparently in Armenian translations,¹ Acacius and Rabbûla, bishop of Edessa, warned the bishops of Armenia (so it would seem), Persian as well as Roman, not to receive the books of Theodore. He was the real author, they urged, of the Nestorian heresy. The bishops of Cilicia assured their colleagues of Armenia that the two prelates, in so informing them, were acting out of personal spite.² But the Armenians did not think so. They held a synod, c. 435; condemned the writings in question;³ and, so as not to be alone in their condemnation of them, dispatched two clerics with a letter from 'the bishops, clergy and monks of Great Armenia and Persia and other nations',⁴ asking for the support of Proclus, archbishop of Constantinople 434-†46. He replied in *The Tome of St. Proclus*,⁵ a celebrated doctrinal epistle of 435, not sufficiently studied in view of its doctrinal importance.⁶ It exhibits an advance from Alexandrian language towards that ultimately adopted at the fourth General Council; an advance from Cyril to Leo, from Ephesus to Chalcedon. Addressing himself to 'the bishops, presbyters and archimandrites of all Armenia',⁶ Proclus gives a clear exposition of the faith of the Incarnate, asserting the unity of Person along with the distinction of Natures. (1) As to 'Nature' (*φύσις*), Cyril had not ordinarily spoken of the Lord's assumed humanity as a 'Nature'.⁷ He had employed the term *φύσις* either of the Lord's Divine Person,⁸ or of the Divine Nature in Christ. Proclus now used it of His human nature⁹; and so prepared the way for the Chalcedonian affirmation of one Christ 'in two Natures'. Then (2) he declined 'One Nature

¹ Hitherto Western Armenia had used Greek, and Eastern Armenia Syriac, for literary purposes and for the liturgy; but under the Catholicus Sahag, 390-442, an Armenian alphabet was formed, so that the national tongue became a written language, Gibbon, c. xxxii, n. 83 (iii. 392); Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 544; Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 408 sq.

² Liberatus, *Breviarium*, § 10 (*P. L.* lxxviii. 990); Fleury, xxvi. xxxvii.

³ Mansi, ix. 240 sqq.

⁴ Proclus, *Ep.* ii (*P. G.* lxxv. 855-74); Mansi, v. 421-38; Fleury, xxvi. xxxvii.

⁵ e.g. in its defence of 'the divine condescension', § 9 (*P. G.* lxxv. 864 sq.), with which cf. Tert. *De carne Christi*, § 2, and H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, i. 200.

⁶ *Ep.* ii (*P. G.* lxxv. 856 B).

⁷ There is a case of it in his sermon at Ephesus, just before his arrest in July 431: see *Conc. Eph.*, Actio vi, No. 7 (Mansi, iv. 1369 E): see also Tixeront, iii. 59.

⁸ e.g. *Ep.* xlvi, § 2 (*Op.* x. 143; *P. G.* lxxvii. 241 B).

⁹ *Ep.* ii, §§ 5, 9 (*P. G.* lxxv. 860 D, 864 C).

(φύσις)' ¹ for 'One Person (ὑπόστασις) of God the Word incarnate.'² Looking back, we observe that this was to avail himself of the later, and Alexandrian, use of the word ὑπόστασις for 'Person', which goes back to the phraseology of Origen, who spoke of 'Three *hypostases*' or 'Persons'.³ And, looking forward, we note that Proclus thus prepared the way for its final employment in that sense and for the consequent fixing, at last, of the word φύσις to the sense of 'Nature', in the phrase of the *Chalcedonian Definition*, 'One Person in two Natures'.⁴ Thirdly, (3) while making it clear that the Godhead is impassible, so that God the Word could not suffer in His Godhead, he claimed the right to affirm that 'One of the Trinity became incarnate'.⁵ The *Tome of Proclus* was accepted not only by Cyril, but by John of Antioch in Synod,⁶ 435: for Proclus had wisely refrained from naming Theodore⁷ though he had appended to his letter some passages which he deemed worthy of condemnation.⁸ But the Synod of Antioch declined to condemn the memory of Theodore, even by accepting the condemnation of passages from his writings,⁹ still less by anathematizing his name: as the envoys of Proclus, without their principal's approval, had desired John to do. John wrote to Cyril that all the trouble was breaking out again; and Cyril and Proclus, after the latter had been informed by Cyril of the dangers ahead,¹⁰ agreed to let the matter drop. They saw that, in the face of the great veneration in which the name of *The Interpreter* was held, the proposal to vilify it would do more harm than good. Thus the question of the posthumous condemna-

¹ Μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σαρκαωμένην, Cyril (*ut sup.*).

² Μίαν ὁμολογῶ τὴν τοῦ σαρκωθέντος Θεοῦ Λόγου ὑπόστασιν, *Ep.* ii, § 9 (*P. G.* lxxv. 864 D).

³ Τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, Origen, *In Ioann.* ii, § 6 (*Op.* iv. 61; *P. G.* xiv. 128 H).

⁴ Μίαν ὑπόστασιν ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, *ap.* Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 233.

⁵ Τὸν ἓνα τῆς Τριάδος σαρκαῶσθαι, *Ep.* ii, § 10 (*P. G.* lxxv. 865 C); Tixeront, iii. 126.

⁶ Mansi, v. 1181-6; Hefele, iii. 154 sq.; Fleury, xxvi. xxxviii. Our informant is Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, in the Byzacene province of Africa, who, c. 546-8, wrote his *Defensio Trium Capitulorum* (*P. L.* lxxvii) in defence of the Co. of Chalcedon for not condemning Theodore: see Bardenhewer, 638.

⁷ See the fragment of the letter of Proclus to John preserved by Facundus, viii, § 2 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 713 A) in Mansi, v. 1186 D, E.

⁸ Liberatus, *Breviarium*, § 10 (*P. L.* lxxviii. 990 C).

⁹ Facundus, *Def. Tr. Cap.* viii, § 4 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 718 C) = Mansi, v. 1184 A from the Synodal Letter addressed to Cyril. It = Cyril, *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* x. 192 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 329 sqq.); tr. Fleury, xxvi. xxxviii.

¹⁰ Cyril, *Ep.* lxxii (*Op.* x. 199-201; *P. G.* lxxvii. 343-6); Fleury, xxvi. xxxvii.

tion of Theodore was passed over till the Fifth Oecumenical Council, at Constantinople in 553¹; and the Emperor supported the letters of Cyril² and Proclus³ to the Synod of Antioch in which they disclaimed any such intention, by urging John and his Council to unity, and desiring that all would make it a rule never to assail the memory of one who had died in the communion of the Church.⁴

§ 11. But there was, meanwhile, a general acquiescence in the repudiation of Nestorianism. The edict against it was entrusted to Aristolaus⁵; who was now sent, on a second mission, to the East with orders to see that it was accepted by all the bishops. The firstfruits of his mission were that Helladius of Tarsus and four other bishops of Cilicia I came in: and wrote to the Emperor, in a synodal letter, affirming their agreement with Sixtus, Proclus, Cyril, and John (where, it may be noted, that they rank the bishop of Constantinople second among Patriarchs), and their repudiation of Nestorius.⁶ Cyril, however, was informed that several bishops in the East alleged that they were under no obligation to do more than condemn Nestorius in word. He therefore wrote to Aristolaus,⁷ and to John of Antioch,⁸ urging that if there was to be a *bona fide* conformity, they must be asked not merely to repudiate Nestorius and his doctrine but to pledge themselves to positive statement of belief in a formula which he specified.⁹ It was Theodoret, in particular, that Cyril thus had in mind.¹⁰ John took no notice; but, writing in 437 to Proclus, to inform him of the results of the mission of Aristolaus, he reported that all had now consented to the deposition of Nestorius and to what was

¹ Mansi, ix. 157 sqq.; Hefele, iv. 307 sqq.

² Cyril, *Ep.* lxvii (*Op.* x. 194-8; *P. G.* lxxvii. 331-8) = *Conc. Eph.* III, c. xlv (Mansi, v. 407-14); tr. Fleury, xxvi. xxxviii.

³ Proclus, *Ep.* x (*P. G.* lxv. 879) = Facundus, viii, § 2 (*P. L.* lxvii. 713 A); Mansi, v. 1186; tr. Fleury, xxvi. xxxviii.

⁴ *Turbam atque tumultum*, ap. Facundus, viii, § 3 (*P. L.* lxvii. 717 c) = Mansi, v. 1183 c, d, and in *Synodicon*, ccix (Mansi, v. 1009 sq.). The two versions differ slightly: see Fleury, xxvi. xxxviii.

⁵ Cyril, *Ep.* lix (*Op.* x. 191; *P. G.* lxxvii. 323 sq.) = *Synodicon*, cxciv (Mansi, v. 969); for this second mission of Aristolaus, see Fleury, xxvi. xxxv.

⁶ *Synodicon*, cxcii (Mansi, v. 967).

⁷ *Epp.* lix, lx (*Op.* x. 192 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 323-6) = *Synodicon*, cxciv, ccix (Mansi, v. 969, 996 sq.).

⁸ *Ep.* lxi (*Op.* x. 192**; *P. G.* lxxviii. 325 sqq.) = *Synodicon*, cxcv (Mansi, v. 970).

⁹ *Ep.* lix (*Op.* x. 192; *P. G.* lxxvii. 323 sq.) = *Synodicon*, cxciv (Mansi, v. 969 c).

¹⁰ *Ep.* lxiii (*Op.* x. 192*; *P. G.* lxxvii. 327 sq.) = *Synodicon*, ccx (Mansi, v. 997).

done for Reunion 'four years ago' through Paul of Emesa. 'What we want is time to take breath after all this tumult: so that we may be free to devote ourselves to the conversion of the heathen in Phoenicia, the Jews in Laodicea, and the handful of the insubordinate Nestorians in Cilicia.'¹ Cyril found, we may suppose, that he had gone too far, for no further action was taken. Nor was it necessary. After the second mission of Aristolaus, he would seem to have heard no more of Nestorianism within the Empire. A reaction was at hand in Eutychianism.

¹ *Synodicon*, cxcvii (Mansi, v. 972-5).

CHAPTER XIV

EUTYCHIANISM, 435-48

§ 1. A DECADE of peace, 436-46, rewarded the efforts of the Government to silence extremists by Aristolaus. John, Cyril, and Proclus once more entered upon relations entirely correct; and, at the capital, Proclus took advantage of this respite to rally the Joannites to his communion by bringing back the relics of St. Chrysostom.¹ His name had been restored to the diptychs of Constantinople in 428, but his body had remained at Comana, where he died in 407. On the Feast of St. Chrysostom, 26 September 437, Proclus was preaching the usual *éloge*,² when the people demanded that John should be restored to them. The archbishop procured an Imperial order to bring back his relics; and, on 27 January 438, they were carried home. The Bosphorus was illuminated,³ as on his first return; and, as the saint was borne in procession through the streets, to his last resting-place in the Church of the Apostles, Theodosius himself, accompanied by Pulcheria,⁴ touched the reliquary with his forehead, and implored the Divine Mercy for his guilty parents, Arcadius and Eudoxia, since, in persecuting Chrysostom, they knew not what they did.⁵ Three weeks later, on 15 February 438, was published the *Theodosian Code* ⁶; and in the same year the Empress Eudocia, b. 394-†460, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. She had made a vow ⁷ that, if she should live to see her daughter Eudoxia married, she would visit the Holy Places. The princess, who was born in 422, was married ⁸ at Constantinople, 21 October 437, to her cousin the Western Emperor, Valentinian III, 425-†55, who ceded Western Illyricum to the Eastern Empire, as the price of the

¹ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xlv; Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxvi; Tillemont, *Mém.* xi. 350 sqq.; Fleury, xxvi. xl; Gibbon, c. xxxii (iii. 381); W. R. W. Stephens, *Life of St. Chrysostom*, 405 sq. ² *Orat.* xx (*P. G.* lxxv. 827-34).

³ Thdt. *H. E.* v. xxxvi, § 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁶ *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. J. Gothofredus, tomi iii (Lugduni, 1665), or *Libri Theodosiani*, edd. T. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer (Berolini, 1905): see Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 76 sq.; Fleury, xxvi. xl.

⁷ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xlvii.

⁸ *Ibid.* xlv; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 75; Fleury, xxvi. xli.

marriage. Eastern Illyricum had belonged to it since 379. The region now ceded was the province of Dalmatia, which was part of the 'Diocese' of Italy, and is now represented by Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. Thus the Eastern shore of the Adriatic in its entirety now belonged to the empire of Theodosius II. The Empress Eudocia then set forth.¹ She built monasteries in Palestine,² and restored the walls of Jerusalem.³ Then she returned, 439, with relics of St. Stephen and others, as the reward of her piety.⁴ To the year of her return belongs the completion of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates.⁵

§ 2. Its completion is a landmark, for, within the next few years, old leaders died off and younger men began to fill their sees.

Thus, John of Antioch died in 440, and was succeeded by his nephew Domnus,⁶ 440-†52.

In the same year died Pope Sixtus III, 432-†40, whom Augustine had won over from lending his patronage, while still a priest, to Pelagianism. As Pope, he kept Julian of Eclanum, 439, at arm's length when he sought readmission to communion⁷; and left a record of benefactions⁸ to the Roman churches so magnificent as to provoke Valentinian III to a like generosity. Sixtus was succeeded by his archdeacon, Leo, who ruled, as Pope,⁹ from 440-†61. Leo was of Tuscan origin, though born in Rome. As acolyte, he had been sent by his predecessor, then a priest, in 418, to carry to Aurelius a letter of reassurance to the Africans.¹⁰ As archdeacon he had obtained for Pope Caelestinus the intervention of Cassian in the Nestorian question; while, under Sixtus, he had twice intervened, with effect, in the issue between semi-Pelagianism and Augustinianism—once to give a lead to central opinion at Rome in 435, and again to shut the door upon Julian. At the death of Sixtus, Leo was absent in Gaul, on a mission to reconcile Aetius,¹¹ the mainstay, 433-†54, of Valentinian III and Galla Placidia his mother, with a smaller rival Albinus. He was elected in absence; and six weeks later arrived in Rome for his

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* i. xx (*Op.* 275; *P. G.* LXXXVI. ii. 2474 sq.).

² *Ibid.* xxi (*Op.* 276; *P. G.* LXXXVI. ii. 2477 A).

³ *Ibid.* xxii (*Op.* 279; *P. G.* LXXXVI. ii. 2484 B).

⁴ Fleury, xxvi. xli.

⁵ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xlviii, § 8.

⁶ Fleury, xxvi. xlv.

⁷ Prosper, *Chron.* [A. D. 439] (*Op.* 747; *P. L.* li. 598 B).

⁸ *Liber Pontificalis*, i. 232 sqq., ed. L. Duchesne; Fleury, xxvi. xlv.

⁹ *Lib. Pont.* i. 238 sqq.; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 414-832; Fleury, xxvi. xlv; C. Gore, *Leo the Great* (S.P.C.K. 1897).

¹⁰ Aug. *Ep.* cxc, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 709 B; *P. L.* xxxiii. 867).

¹¹ Gibbon, c. xxxv (iii. 447 sqq.); Hodgkin, i. ii. 874 sqq.

consecration¹ on Michaelmas Day, 440. 'Leo', says Milman, 'is the only great name in the Empire: it might seem also in the Christian world.'² He was the man that the hour demanded; for the Western Empire lay at its last gasp, and the Church in the East was torn by heresies. Leo, though the first of the Popes to be a great preacher and the first—with the possible exception of Pope Dionysius, 259-†68—to take rank among theologians,³ was, before all things, a ruler. He was ready for his mission, as is clear from the sermons with which he was wont to celebrate the day of his 'nativity' or consecration.⁴ The first, on the day itself, betrays his consciousness of power; for he makes no profession of unwillingness, but praises God for his appointment, thanks the people, and asks their prayers.⁵ In *Sermons* II-V, preached on anniversaries of his consecration, Leo dwells not now on his capacity but on his right to rule.⁶ His is 'the church which into the see of Peter has received Peter himself'.⁷ Peter, according to Leo, is the founder and even the present administrator of the Roman see. The Pope seems to suppose 'a continual, one might almost say mystical, presence of St. Peter with and in his successors'⁸; for 'Peter has never quitted that guidance of the church which he received; since, in his see, there lives on his power and the excellence of his authority'.⁹ Moreover, 'if the other Apostles had anything in common with Peter, their powers were only transmitted to them through him'.¹⁰ He is mediator between Christ and the other Apostles; and, as in his character of 'head'¹¹ of the body, the only immediate recipient, then the 'channel' too,¹² of sacerdotal grace. Such plenitude of authority Leo claimed for himself.¹³ It is the more noteworthy that he

¹ Prosper, *Chron.* (A. D. 440) (*Op.* 748; *P. L.* li. 599 A).

² H. H. Milman, *Latin Chr.*⁴ i. 228.

³ On Leo as theologian, see W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo*², x. sqq.

⁴ 'In natali ipsius,' i-v; cf. 'Hunc servitutis nostræ natalitium diem,' *Sermo*, iv, § 4 (*Op.* i. 19; *P. L.* liv. 152 B).

⁵ *Sermo*, i (*Op.* i. 7 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 141 sq.).

⁶ For the Petrine claims of St. Leo see W. Bright, *Sermons*², &c., 178 sqq.; C. Gore, *St. Leo*, 90 sqq. They were an expansion of the theories put forward by Damasus and Siricius: see E. Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 69 sq.

⁷ Leo, *Sermo*, ii, § 2 (*Op.* i. 9 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 144 A), and Document No. 225.

⁸ Gore, *Leo the Great*, 91.

⁹ *Sermo*, iii, § 3 (*Op.* i. 12; *P. L.* liv. 146 c), and Document No. 225.

¹⁰ Gore, *Leo the Great*, 93.

¹¹ Leo, *Ep.* x, § 1 (*Op.* i. 633; *P. L.* liv. 629).

¹² Leo, *Sermo*, iv, § 2 (*Op.* i. 16; *P. L.* liv. 149 sq.).

On these two passages, see Denny, §§ 846 sqq.

¹³ 'The importance of such a claim as this cannot be exaggerated; if it be

freely recognized the sacerdotal character of the Christian laity.¹ He should have an honourable place therefore among 'the most earnest maintainers of an external or hierarchical priesthood', who 'have emphatically asserted the internal priesthood, or consecrated character, of all the baptized'.² And 'had he been told', as Luther was the first to tell the world,³ 'that the ideas of a ministerial and of a general priesthood excluded each other, he would have answered, in effect, that the former was the appointed organ of the corporate exercise of the latter, and in no way interfered with its individual exercise'.⁴

Not long after the archdeacon Leo was seated in the throne of Sixtus, Cyril died,⁵ 9 June 444; and was succeeded by *his* archdeacon Dioscorus⁶ who became Patriarch of Alexandria, 444-51. We need not attach any value to a coarse and ferocious invective against the memory of Cyril,⁷ which was quoted as Theodoret's at the Fifth General Council of 553.⁸ Newman is right to 'scout the idea' that it was his,⁹ particularly since it was quoted there as having been addressed to John of Antioch who died before Cyril. But it may reflect contemporary feelings of relief in Syria; and, perhaps, too, of Alexandrians, at being rid, at last, of the domination of Theophilus and his nephew which they had endured for sixty years. It was an expensive tyranny,¹⁰ and Cyril is not an attractive saint.¹¹ But he has been very

admitted, the whole question is settled, and separation from Rome is separation from grace, and therefore from Christ,' Gore, *Leo the Great*, 93.

¹ 'Quid tam sacerdotale quam . . . immaculatas pietatis hostias de altari cordis offerre?' *Sermo*, iv, § 1 (*Op.* i. 15; *P. L.* liv. 149 A).

² W. Bright, *Ancient Collects*, 99, note h; *Letters*, 111: see St. Thos. Aq. *Summa*, iii. lxxii ad l.

³ In his 'Address to the Nobility of the German Nation' of 1520: see *Luther's Primary Works* ², 164 (edd. H. Wace and C. A. Buchheim).

⁴ W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo* ², 204, and p. ix, n. 1.

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 654; Fleury, xxvii. i.

⁶ Fleury, xxvii. iii.

⁷ 'Sero tandem et vix malus homo defunctus est,' Thdt. *Ep.* clxxx (*Op.* iv. 1362 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1489 sqq.). It cannot have been Theodoret's; for elsewhere he testifies to the pleasant relations between himself and Cyril, *Ep.* lxxxiii (*Op.* iv. 1151; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 1273 B).

⁸ At Session V (Mansi, ix. 295).

⁹ *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 359 n.

¹⁰ One of the complaints against Dioscorus, at the third session of the Co. of Chalcedon, was that he had made Cyril's nephews, Athanasius and Paul, disgorge the wealth that their uncle had bestowed upon them, Mansi, vi. 1024; Fleury, xxviii. xiii.

¹¹ On the character of Cyril, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 656 sq.; Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 353; W. Bright, *Ch. Hist.* 370; *D. C. B.* i. 772; *Waymarks*, 138 sqq.; *Age of the Fathers*, ii. 424 sqq.

hardly used by modern writers because they could not understand his zeal for a doctrine¹: while, as for the 'blameless' Nestorius—so they call him²—he began as a persecutor of heretics.³ The cause which Cyril sustained was of supreme moment. The heresy he opposed was a heresy fatal to the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Sacraments; and it was identified with the name of Nestorius, a man of great abilities, who not only held the then most important see in Christendom but was backed by the whole weight of Imperial influence. Cyril made mistakes in the conduct of the controversy, but he never lost sight of the fact that the issues were vital. His title to our veneration is that the contest has been decided, long since, in Cyril's way; and Cyril's judgement has been ratified by all subsequent Christendom.

Proclus, it will be remembered, was one of the first of theologians, contemporary with Cyril, to adjust and yet, on the whole, to ratify that judgement. He died on 24 October 446, and was succeeded, as Patriarch of Constantinople, by Flavian, 446-†9.

And thus new leaders—Leo, Flavian, Dioscorus, and Domnus occupied the chief sees of Christendom.

§ 3. In Antioch, however, and 'the East', one of the original protagonists, and other leaders of second rank, survived; and, with them, its strong tradition of an anti-Cyrrilline orthodoxy. Domnus, nephew to John and heir no less to his doctrinal position than to his throne, still had the aid of his uncle's adviser, Theodoret; and Theodoret, since the death of Cyril, was *facile princeps* among theologians of the Eastern Empire. Ibas who, on the death of Rabbûla, succeeded him as bishop of Edessa, 435-†57, brought over that great Christian centre to the anti-Cyrrilline side. And such was the security of the Orientals that they ventured upon the promotion to the episcopate of Count Irenaeus. As friend to Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus, Irenaeus had played the part of Imperial agent there though with no definite commission⁴; and afterwards, of emissary of the minority to the Court.⁵ Condemned with Nestorius to banishment in August 435, he occupied his leisure in writing a history of the troubles in which he had borne part, with violent invectives against all who had questioned the orthodoxy of his friend. The work, once known as the *Tragoedia Irenaei*, c. 440, is now lost, except in so

¹ Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 275.

² W. Bright, *Waymarks*, 166.

³ Soer. *H. E.* vii. xxix, §§ 5-12; Gibbon, c. xlvii (v. 121).

⁴ Fleury, xxv. xxxiv.

⁵ Ibid. xlvi, lv.

far as it has been translated into Latin and preserved, with additions of a similar character, in the *Synodicon*¹ of an African controversialist who wrote after the death of Justinian, †565, and was an admirer of Cyril, Theodoret, and Ibas, but an opponent of Nestorius.² He himself gave to his work the name *Synodicon*,³ and it is commonly known as the *Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenaei*. Twelve years of exile, 435-46, seem to have softened the animosities of the author of the *Tragoedia*; for Theodoret, in letters written after the Count's elevation to the episcopate, speaks of his readiness to adopt the test-word *Theotokos*⁴ and testifies to his reputation as a man of amiable and generous disposition,⁵ with an interest in Biblical questions and in casuistry.⁶ It would also seem that Irenaeus got back into the good graces of Theodosius; for Domnus would never have dared to fetch him to be made bishop from a place of exile. He was a digamist, it is true; but this disqualification was overruled by reference to precedents, and he must also have given guarantees for his heretical past. At any rate, consecrated he was to be bishop of Tyre, 447-8 and metropolitan of Phoenicia: and the consecration, recognized as it was not only throughout Syria but by the bishops of Pontus and, in writing, by Proclus at Constantinople,⁷ is evidence of the strong position of the anti-Cyrrilline orthodoxy traditional at Antioch, just on the eve of new movements elsewhere in an ultra-Cyrrilline direction. Antioch further strengthened its position by an understanding with Constantinople allowing Proclus to exercise jurisdiction in Asia⁸ while, in accordance with an Imperial Rescript,⁹ Proclus proceeded in a synod of 437 to wrest Illyricum, notwithstanding the protests of Sixtus III,¹⁰ from its ecclesiastical connexion with the Roman See.¹¹

¹ Text in Mansi, v. 731-1022; Thdt. *Op.* v. 608-906 (*P. G.* lxxxiv. 551-864); and for an account of it, Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 605; *D. C. B.* iii. 280 sqq.; W. Bright, *Waymarks*, 161; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 388, n. 2.

² *Synodicon*, cxciii; Thdt. *Op.* v. 847 (*P. G.* lxxxiv. 806 B).

³ *Ibid.* ccv; Thdt. *Op.* v. 875 (*P. G.* lxxxiv. 833 A).

⁴ Thdt. *Ep.* xvi (*Op.* iv. 1077 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1193 A, B).

⁵ *Ep.* xxxv (*Op.* iv. 1095; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1212 D).

⁶ *Ep.* iii (*Op.* iv. 1061-4; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1175-80).

⁷ Thdt. *Ep.* cx (*Op.* iv. 1179; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1305).

⁸ *Ep.* lxxxvi (*Op.* iv. 1157; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1280 D).

⁹ *Omni innovatione cessante* of 14 July 421, *Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 45.

¹⁰ Sixtus, *Epp.* ix, x (*P. L.* l. 612-18); Jaffé, Nos. 395-6.

¹¹ Eastern Illyricum had been handed over to the Eastern Empire in 378, and Western Illyricum in 437. The Eastern principle was that ecclesiastical divisions must conform to civil. It was to prevent the loss of Eastern Illyricum, ecclesiastically, to his rival at CP., that Damasus hit upon the

§ 4. But the security of the 'Orientals' was presently menaced by the ultra-Cyrriline party, bent on crushing Nestorianism, as they would call it, to the roots. They clung to 'One incarnate nature (*φύσις*) of God the Word'—the formula which Cyril had adopted on the supposed authority of Athanasius. Certainly, *The Reunion Creed of the Antiochenes* had asserted 'two natures'; and Cyril, in accepting it, had explained that by 'one nature' (*φύσις*) he meant 'One Person' (*ὑπόστασις*). But there were two Cyrils¹: one who spoke in unguarded, and another in official, language.² And many—monks especially—sympathized with his spontaneous language; cherished the phrase 'One incarnate Nature (*φύσις*) of God the Word'; and dropped the explanations. 'One Nature,' they said: 'any abatement of this'—and the *Formulary of Reunion* was itself, in their eyes, suspect because it was dyophysite—'will undo the work of the Council of Ephesus.' They would not be likely to be theologians, but mystics and devotees. They would, therefore, naturally minimize the human side in the Incarnation, out of a misguided reverence which, alike with them and with Nestorianism, was the parent of heresy.³ So they clung to their formula—'Two Natures before the Union: One after'. Whether they attached an intelligent meaning to it is another question. If so, they probably thought of the Human nature as absorbed by the Divine. But, at any

device of exercising his patriarchal jurisdiction, hitherto unquestioned, over Eastern Illyricum by making Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, his Vicar for that purpose. His successors followed up the expedient, and it was successful for a time. Then, all of a sudden, it collapsed; when the whole of Illyricum, east and west, was, by the law of 14 July 421, assigned to the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople. The question throughout is of the patriarchal, not of the papal, authority of the Roman See; cf. Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 1209-12.

¹ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 405.

² The unguarded and spontaneous language was that of his Twelve Articles. They never received oecumenical sanction. The more considered and diplomatic language was that of the Second Letter to Nestorius and of the Letter to John. These two letters were read at the Synod of CP., November 448, to the exclusion of the Third Letter to Nestorius, i. e. the letter with the Twelve Anathematisms.

³ For heresy of the mystical sort, prompted by misguided reverence, cf. Docetism, as appearing in Clement of Alexandria and Hilary of Poitiers (A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*², 237 sqq.), or Marcionism (Tert. *De carne Christi*, c. ii), or Apollinarianism; and for heresy of the rationalistic sort, equally prompted by mistaken reverence, cf. Nestorianism (Socr. *H. E.* vii. xxxiv, § 5). It is out of a similarly misguided reverence that popular protestantism has unconsciously used arguments that are really rationalistic against the principle of sacramental operation: see H. P. Liddon, *Univ. Sermons*, i. 200, and W. Bright, *St. Leo*², 159.

rate, such was their theory—or rather, their creed; and, as a party, they were strongly entrenched both at Alexandria and at Constantinople.

§ 5. At Alexandria they were led by the new patriarch, Dioscorus,¹ 444-51 [†54]. He had been Cyril's archdeacon; and, in the end, he probably deteriorated in character, like Theophilus and Cyril, under long enjoyment of absolute power. He was unmarried, and at once gained the affections of his people by lending money without interest to bakers and vintners so that they might supply bread and wine to the Alexandrians at a low price. But to do this he extorted large sums from the relatives of his predecessor²—if we may believe Liberatus, the Carthaginian deacon who, about 560, wrote an abridgement of the events of 428-553, called his *Breviarium causae Nestorianae et Eutychianae*,³ from the point of view of an admirer of Theodoret who thought that Cyril had gone too far, and that the peril lay on the Monophysite side. Similar accusations⁴ had been made at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, by the deacons Theodore⁵ and Ischyron⁶; by Cyril's nephews, the priest Athanasius⁷ and Paul who put it that Dioscorus had compelled them to surrender; and by Sophronius,⁸ a layman who bluntly affirmed that 'the country seemed to belong to Dioscorus rather than to the Sovereigns'. But against all this, it must be remembered that the name of Dioscorus had been blackened by his support of Monophysitism; while Theodoret, whose testimony in his favour cannot lie open to suspicion, speaks of his reputation for modesty, in a letter addressed to him soon after his consecration.⁹ We ought, perhaps, to make some allowance for the conventional courtesies of an Oriental's letter of congratulation. But, let the exact truth be what it may as to the character of the new Patriarch of Alexandria, Theodoret's endeavour to conciliate him shows that he looked upon him as a very important personage. So also did Pope Leo. Dioscorus had sent Posidonius to Rome—he had been there before as the envoy of Cyril to Caelesthine—to announce his consecration; and Leo replied with *Quantum dilectioni tuae*¹⁰ of 21 June 445.

¹ Fleury, xxvii. iii; W. Bright in *D. C. B.* i. 854 sqq.

² Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. x (*P. L.* lxxviii. 992 B, c).

³ Bardenhewer, 641.

⁴ Fleury, xxviii. xiii.

⁵ Mansi, vi. 1008 c.

⁶ Ibid. 1016 sq.

⁷ Ibid. 1024 c, d.

⁸ Ibid. 1032 c.

⁹ *Ep.* lx (*Op.* iv. 113; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1232 B).

¹⁰ *Ep.* ix (*Op.* i. 628-32; *P. L.* liv. 624-7); Jaffé, No. 406; Fleury, xxvii. iii.

Anxious, as it would seem, for the goodwill of Dioscorus, Leo reminds him, § 1, of the relations desirable between the see of St. Mark and the see of St. Peter: there ought to be uniformity of discipline as between Alexandria and Rome. He therefore desires that, at Alexandria, ordinations should be held on the Lord's Day only, both bishop and ordinand fasting; and, further, § 2, that, on the Great Feasts, when crowds are apt to be so great that the church cannot hold them all at once, they should feel no scruple in repeating 'the Offering of the Sacrifice' as often as the church is refilled. It is clear from this that, at Rome and Alexandria, the Holy Sacrifice was at this time only offered in one church, even on the greatest Feast Days. It is clear too that, while Leo 'did not miss the opportunity of giving directions as from the see of St. Peter to the new successor of St. Mark',¹ the latter, in the person of Dioscorus, was a power both to be courted and reckoned with. He was the ecclesiastical chief of the ultra-Cyrrilline movement.

§ 6. At Constantinople this movement also had its religious leader in Eutyches; and, through his godson,² Chrysaphius, the all-powerful minister of Theodosius, the support of the Court.

Eutyches, a monk and a priest, had been for thirty years archimandrite of a monastery near Constantinople of about three hundred monks. He had been a zealous opponent of Nestorius: and when, at the request of Cyril and his friends, Dalmatius had headed a deputation to the Emperor on their behalf, Eutyches had taken part.³ On the death of Dalmatius, †440, Eutyches succeeded to his authority. Not that he was anything of a theologian: Leo, indeed, speaks of him as 'rash and unskilled'⁴ in such matters. But he was devout and tenacious, and clung doggedly to the phrase adopted by his party—'Two natures before the Union; but, after it, One'.⁵ As one of the celebrities of contemporary asceticism, Eutyches carried the monastic world with him, and he would have had a long arm, on that score alone.

¹ *D. C. B.* i. 855. ² Liberatus, *Breviarium*, xi (*P. L.* lxxviii. 998 c).

³ *Synodicon*, cciii (Mansi, v. 989 B).

⁴ *Ep.* xxviii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 801; *P. L.* liv. 757 A): see also *Epp.* xxix, xxx, § 1 (*Op.* i. 839, 848; *P. L.* liv. 781 B, 787 A).

⁵ That this formula, from which Eutyches in 448 could not be moved, was already a watchword of his party, is clear from the fact that Theodoret deals with it, 446-7, *Dial.* ii (*Op.* iv. 99; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 137 A); W. Bright, *Later Treatises of St. Ath.* 196.

But he also enjoyed the ear of the Court. In 444, the Empress Eudocia, after twenty-three years of married life, incurred the suspicion of unfaithfulness to her husband, and was banished to Jerusalem, where she died, 20 October 453.¹ Pulcheria, it might have been thought, would have resumed any influence over her brother which she might have lost to her sister-in-law. But the Emperor, perhaps, was tired of being governed by women. At any rate, before the misunderstanding with Eudocia led to her removal, Theodosius II placed himself, 441, in the hands of the eunuch, Chrysaphius²—the last and worst of a succession of favourites³ who, in this reign, ruled the Emperor and the Empire. The Court, hitherto, had been accustomed, as a matter of course, to further both the ambition and the theology of the bishop of Constantinople. But when Flavian succeeded Proclus, he made the mistake of sending Chrysaphius no golden ‘eulogies’, but simply some white bread as a symbol of his blessing.⁴ It was certain, therefore, that whenever the claims or the doctrine of Flavian lay open to attack, the Court, instead of taking his side as Theodosius had stood by Nestorius, would be ranged against him—so long, at any rate, as Chrysaphius was supreme in the palace. No sooner, then, had Flavian found himself embroiled with the old abbot Eutyches, who was godfather to Chrysaphius, than his doctrine, whatever its merits, was doomed: while Dioscorus who, as Patriarch of Alexandria, would be ever on the watch to humble once more the rival see of Constantinople, would seize the opportunity to join in with Eutyches. Pulcheria, it is true, never failed in her sympathies with Flavian; but, during the ascendancy of Chrysaphius, 441-50, she did not count. It was this ascendancy that ensured the triumph of Eutyches and his party till, on the death of Theodosius by a fall from his horse,⁵ 28 July 450, Pulcheria mounted the throne.

§ 7. To oppose this party, who looked upon him as little better than a Nestorianizing busybody, Theodoret took the field with

¹ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 85 sq.

² Ibid. 89; *Mém.* xv. 438 sq.; Gibbon, cc. xxxiv, xlvii (*Op.* iii. 442, v. 121); Hodgkin, ii. 54.

³ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 117-19, for the succession.

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 446; Fleury, xxvii. xii.

⁵ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 115; Fleury, xxvii. xlvii; Gibbon, c. xxxiv (iii. 444); Hodgkin, ii. 97. For the fall from a horse as an event in history, cf. William the Conqueror at Mantes, 15 August 1087, and William III at Hampton Court, 8 March 1702.

his *Eranistes seu Polymorphus*,¹ 446-7. 'Some clerics of Osrhöene,² and some Eutychianizing monks, ambitious, as he says, of ruling the Church,³ but without any claim to consideration on the ground of learning or of services to her cause,⁴ were active in aspersing him as a heretic.'⁵ He hastens, therefore, to clear himself in *The Beggar or the Polymorph*: a title which, as he explains in his preface, he adopted by way of indicating that the 'nascent'⁶ Eutychianism was nothing more than a motley of ill-matched rags collected beggar-wise⁷ from well-worn theories more or less Gnostic in character. The work is divided into four books. In the first three he sets forth, by way of a dialogue between a Beggar and an Orthodox believer (1) the unchangeable [*Immutabilis*⁸] character of the Divinity of our Lord, where he shows how 'the Word became flesh', viz. 'by assuming manhood'⁹; (2) the non-mixture [*Inconfusus*¹⁰] of the Divinity and the humanity,¹¹ in this process, where he insists that Christ may really be called man, even God and man, but God and man in one Person; and he illustrates his point by an argument from the Eucharist to the Incarnation. In both, there is a real outward, and a real inward, part, and a real union of the two¹²; (3) the impassibility [*Impatiti-*

¹ Thdt. *Op.* iv. 1-263 (*P. G.* lxxxiii. 27-318); tr. *N. and P.-N. F.* iii. 160-244 and (abridged) with notes by W. Bright in *Later Tr. of St. Ath.* (*L. F.* xlv. 179-227). On it, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 270 sqq.; Fleury, xxvii. xiv; Bardenhewer, 372; and on its Christology, A. B. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*², 59, Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 94-8.

² Thdt. *Ep.* lxxxvii (*Op.* iv. 1158; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1281 B).

³ *Ep.* lxxxi (*Op.* iv. 1140; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1261 A). 'Ces passages conviennent fort bien à Eutyche,' Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 482.

⁴ Preface to *Eranistes* (*Op.* iv. 1; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 28 A). 'Ce qui convient assez bien à Eutyche,' Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 271.

⁵ W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 177.

⁶ Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 359.

⁷ *Eranistes*, Praef. (*Op.* iv. 2; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 29 A).

⁸ Ἀτρέπτος.

⁹ *Dial.* i (*Op.* iv. 10; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 37 A), cited by R. Hooker, *E. P.* v. liv, § 4.

¹⁰ Ἀσύγχυτος.

¹¹ In this connexion the position of *Eranistes* is Ἐκ δύο φύσεων λέγω τὸν Χριστόν, δύο δὲ φύσεις οὐ λέγω, *Op.* iv. 101 (*P. G.* lxxxiii. 140 A); a position afterwards reaffirmed by Dioscorus at the Council of Chalcedon—τὸ ἐκ δύο δέχομαι τὸ δύο οὐ δέχομαι, Mansi, vi. 692 A; W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 198, note e.

¹² *Dial.* ii (*Op.* iv. 126; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 168 B, C), and Document No. 222. For other examples of the argument from the Eucharist to the Incarnation, note the use which (1) Cyril makes of it against Nestorianism, *Ep.* [iii. ad Nest.] xvii (*Op.* x. 72; *P. G.* lxxvii. 113 C, D), and which (2) Pope Gelasius, 492-†6, makes of it against Eutychianism, *Tract* III [De duabus naturis], § 14, ap. A. Thiel, *Epist. Rom. Pont.* i. 541 sq. For the bearing of these passages on the Real Presence and on Transubstantiation, see W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 208, note p; and Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* iii. 239, 365-7, who holds that Gelasius is quoting 'considerations urged by others'—a convenient way of getting rid of the testimony of a Pope against the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation.

bilis ^{1]} of the Divinity, where he contends that, the Godhead being impassible, it was as man that our Lord suffered ; but at the same time ‘ really grants all that Cyril had demanded : for he admits that it was “ He ” who suffered as man, that selfsame “ He ” who is “ God the Word ” ’ ² ; the difference between them, as Hooker observes, ³ being merely verbal. The fourth book is a syllogistic summary of the preceding arguments. The work, as a whole, though verbally at variance with Cyril at points, showed a substantial agreement with him. But it also prepared the way for the dyophysite decisions of the *Tome* of St. Leo and the *Definition* of Chalcedon.

We need not, then, be surprised that, by way of a counterblast, the Eutychian party resolved that Theodoret and his friends, Ibas of Edessa and Irenaeus of Tyre, were to be put down. They were attacked in turn, 447-8.

§ 8. The first blow fell on Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre. ⁴ He was specially obnoxious to the party in power, as the *quondam* friend of Nestorius. Premonitions of his coming trouble reached Irenaeus ; and he sought the advice of Theodoret who urged him, under a parable, not to abandon his flock except perforce. ⁵ So the bishop of Tyre stood fast ; and, meanwhile, Theodoret endeavoured to get Domnus to intervene at Constantinople. ⁶ But in vain : for 16 February 448 there came forth a Rescript ⁷ proscribing the works of Porphyry and of Nestorius ; and, ‘ in order that all may learn by experience how our Divinity abhors those who adopt the impious belief of Nestorius, we ordain that Irenaeus, who formerly incurred our indignation on this account, and afterwards, we know not how (although, as we learn, he had twice married), was made bishop of Tyre contrary to the Apostolic rules, shall be expelled from the church of Tyre, and live only in his own country, wholly deprived of the garb and the title of a bishop.’ The proceeding was characteristically Byzantine : an intrusion of the civil power into the realm of the spiritual authority ⁸ worthy of Con-

¹ Ἀπαθής.

² *Dial.* iii (*Op.* iv. 187 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 233 c), and W. Bright, *Later Tr.* 214, note c.

³ *E. P.* v. liii, § 4.

⁴ Fleury, xxvii. xviii.

⁵ *Thdt. Ep.* iii (*Op.* iv. 1061-4 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1175-80).

⁶ *Ep.* cx (*Op.* iv. 1179-81 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1303-6).

⁷ *Conc. Eph.* iii. xlvii (Mansi, v. 417-20), and Justinian, *Codex*, i. i. 3, where the date is given. It was accompanied by an Edict, q.v. in *Conc. Eph.* iii. xlviii (Mansi, v. 419 sq.).

⁸ The more so as the Rescript not only ignores the rights of Domnus and

stantius. But there was no help for it: and on 9 September 448¹ Domnus had to consecrate Photius to be bishop of Tyre 448-51.

§ 9. In the same year Domnus found himself forced to take cognizance of accusations stirred up against Ibas,² bishop of Edessa 435-†57. While still a presbyter, Ibas, in the letter to Maris, or Mar Dadyeshu, already alluded to, had accepted the union between John and Cyril as if it were a retractation on the part of 'the Egyptian', and had branded his bishop, Rabbûla, as a tyrant and a turncoat. The letter escaped censure at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, being taken in connexion with other and more satisfactory language of its author.³ But it was condemned at the Fifth General Council, at its last session,⁴ 2 June 553; no doubt because of the abuse which Ibas heaped upon the XII Articles of Cyril. On the death of Rabbûla, Cyril's ardent supporter in Syria, a wave of reaction carried Ibas to the vacant throne. But friends of Rabbûla among the clergy of Edessa resented the appointment: specially because the new bishop had circulated, in Syriac, translations of the works of Theodore, the very divine whom his predecessor had anathematized. They complained to Proclus: and Proclus, in 437, wrote to John of Antioch, urging him to try to persuade Ibas to clear himself.⁵ But no one in 'The East', neither John nor Ibas, would consent so to malign the memory of *The Interpreter*: and nothing was done. Accordingly, the affair of Ibas dropped, until four presbyters—Samuel, Maras, Cyrus, and Eulogius—prompted by one of his suffragans, Uranius, bishop of Himeria 445-51, in correspondence with Eutyches,⁶ found opportunity to accuse him before Domnus: first, at Hierapolis, 445, whither Domnus had gone to consecrate Stephen bishop of that city,⁷ 446-59: and,

his bishops to fill up their sees, but also sets aside the *Formulary of Reunion* as the doctrinal standard adopted since 433; and rules that the decrees of Nicaea and Ephesus, as interpreted by Cyril, are to take its place (Mansi, v. 417 D).

¹ A date provided by the Syriac *acta* of the *Latrocinium*, Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'Église*, iii. 402, n. 1.

² Liberatus, *Breviarium*, § 12 (*P. L.* lxviii. 992 sq.); Tillemont, xv. 465-77; Fleury, xxvii. xix-xxii; S. G. F. Perry, *The second Synod of Ephesus*, 28-145; P. Martin, *Le brigandage d'Éphèse*, 92 sqq.

³ His case was gone into at sessions ix, x of 27-8 October 451; Fleury, xxviii. xxv; Hefele, iii. 358-70.

⁴ Canon xiv; Mansi, ix. 385-8; Hefele, iv. 340.

⁵ Proclus, *Ep.* iii, §§ 2, 3 (*P. G.* lxxv. 875 sq.).

⁶ *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio ix (Mansi, vii. 196 B).

⁷ *Ibid.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 236 D).

afterwards, in the Lent of 448, at Antioch. Domnus received their memorial, and referred it to a Council to meet at Antioch after Easter.¹ But by the time it met, the plaintiffs had gone off to Constantinople, where, aided by Eutyches, they procured an Imperial mandate,² of 26 October 448, appointing a commission to hear and determine the case of Ibas. It was to consist of Uranius himself, Photius, the new metropolitan of Tyre, 449-51, and his suffragan, Eustathius, bishop of Berytus (Beyrout) 448-58. The dates and the course of events are somewhat obscure³; but the commissioners appear to have sat first at Beyrout, 1 February 449.⁴ Here the proceedings were inconclusive. They then adjourned to Tyre; but were driven to acquit Ibas, for sixty-one of his clergy intervened in his favour, asking for his return before Easter,⁵ 27 March; and a superficial reconciliation was patched up between him and his accusers,⁶ 25 February 449. For the moment the attack had failed; but no sooner had the bishop returned to Edessa than it was renewed, under an Imperial order, for a further trial to be carried out by the Count Chaereas, president of the province of Osrhöene. Chaereas was met, on his arrival,⁷ 12 April 449, by a crowd of monks who shouted down Ibas as a Nestorianizer; and the sentence, 18 April, was a foregone conclusion. It only remained for Eutyches to complete the ruin of Ibas by instigating Chrysaphius to procure his banishment⁸; and, on 27 June 449, by an Imperial order, Ibas was deposed.⁹ His deposition was confirmed, 22 August,

¹ *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 213 c); P. Martin, *Le brigandage d'Éphèse*, 101 sqq.

² *Ibid.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 209).

³ Discussed in Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 897, n. 13; Fleury, xxvii. xix (iii. 265, note k); Hefele, iii. 181.

⁴ 'Postconsulatum Flavii Zenonis et Postumiani . . . Kal. Sept,' *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 211); (a) If *post* = 'post initum consulatum', the date would be 1 Sept. 448; but (b) if 'post consulatum' means what it says, viz. the year after Z. and P. were consuls, then the year is 449, and we must alter 'Kal. Sept.' to 'Kal. Feb.': see S. G. F. Perry, *The second Synod of Ephesus*, 33.

⁵ Ibas was accused of having said, 'I do not envy Christ's becoming God' (Mansi, vii. 249 c). His clergy say that they never heard him say anything of the kind: see their memorial in *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 249-56), with their signatures. They want him at Easter, they say, for catechizing and baptizing (ib. 252 A). They consist of 13 priests, 30 deacons, 11 subdeacons, and 1 reader. They sign some in Greek, and some in Syriac. The letter is therefore interesting and important as illustrative of the rites, the organization, and the bilingual character of the church of Edessa, c. 450, Document No. 207.

⁶ *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio ix (Mansi, vii. 201 c).

⁷ Perry, 44 sqq.

⁸ Liberatus, *Breviarium*, § 12 (P. L. lxxviii. 1004 A).

⁹ *D. C. B.* iii. 194.

at the second session of the Robber-Council of Ephesus¹; and the unfortunate prelate is said to have had experience of as many as twenty successive places of imprisonment² before he was restored to his see by the Council of Chalcedon, on condition of anathematizing both Nestorius and Eutyches and of accepting the *Tome* of St. Leo.³ Ibas must have been glad to do it; and he died bishop of Edessa, 28 October 457.

§ 10. Meanwhile, in the year before his expulsion, the Eutychians also succeeded in putting Theodoret on his defence,⁴ 448. It was probably in 447 that some Syrian monks came to Alexandria, and accused Theodoret 'of dividing the one Lord Jesus Christ into two sons, when preaching at Antioch'.⁵ They also made the same charge against the bishops of Cilicia.⁶ Dioscorus needed no exciting against the Easterns. He assumed at once the truth of the indictment, and wrote about it; both to Theodoret⁷ and to Domnus,⁸ complaining of Theodoret. The latter saw the communication to his Patriarch, and, to clear himself, wrote at once to Dioscorus a letter full of the lively detail which makes Theodoret's correspondence, though one of the last, not the least interesting, of the collections of patristic letters. With pardonable complacency he assures Dioscorus that, for five and twenty years, he had preached at Antioch; six under Theodotus; thirteen under John, 'who was so pleased with my sermons that he would rise from his throne and clap his hands,'⁹ and now six under Domnus. Crowds had listened to him; and never had fault been found with his teaching. He then proceeds to an elaborate statement of belief in the unity of our Lord's Person, in the course of which he accepts the term *Theotokos*¹⁰; repudiates 'those who divide our one Lord into two persons or two sons'¹¹; turns his

¹ Mansi, vii. 205 B; Fleury, xxvii. xli; Perry, 134-45.

² *Conc. Chalc.*, Actio x (Mansi, vii. 204 sq.).

³ Ibid. (Mansi, vii. 268 sq.).

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 268 sqq.; Fleury, xxvii. xiii-xvii; Martin, 103 sqq.

⁵ Thdt. *Ep.* lxxxiii (*Op.* iv. 1146; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1268 B). That the accusers were monks or clerks from Osrhöene is probable from *Ep.* lxxxvii (*Op.* iv. 1158; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1281 B).

⁶ *Epp.* lxxxiv, lxxxv (*Op.* iv. 1152, 1154; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1276 A, 1277 A); Fleury, xviii. xv.

⁷ *Ep.* lxxxvi (*Op.* iv. 1156; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1280 A).

⁸ *Ep.* lxxxiii (*Op.* iv. 1146; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1268 B), and Document No. 223.

⁹ Ibid. (*Op.* iv. 1146; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1268 C).

¹⁰ Ibid. (*Op.* iv. 1148; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1269 C).

¹¹ Ibid. (*Op.* iv. 1148; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1269 D).

back on the interpretation given by Theodore to 'My Lord and my God'¹ (for Theodore had made it, not a confession of the Divinity of the Son but a glorification of the Father); and recalls his happy intercourse with 'Cyril, of blessed memory'.² Theologically, the letter is of great importance, as illustrating the *Dialogues*. But it made no impression on Dioscorus. On the contrary, at Alexandria he allowed the calumniators of Theodoret to anathematize him in the Cathedral; and himself 'stood up in his place and confirmed their words'. Dioscorus thus openly declared himself the patron of the party which was responsible for all these intrigues, while he also took care to send envoys to carry the charge to Court.³ Of this, Theodoret complained in an interesting letter to Flavian. 'Judged', he writes, 'by the canons of Nicaea and Constantinople, the action of Dioscorus is *ultra vires*: he has no authority beyond Egypt. Boast as he may, of the chair of St. Mark, he knows very well that Antioch is heir to the throne of St. Peter, who was not only teacher of Mark but "first and coryphaeus of the company of the Apostles"'.⁴ The real reason for his annoyance is that we Easterns, in assenting to a letter of Proclus, had in his view acknowledged the jurisdiction of Constantinople over Antioch, and so compromised the churches both of Antioch and Alexandria.'⁵ This was a clever bid for the support of Flavian. But Theodoret was not only of doubtful orthodoxy, 'he was an ecclesiastical busybody. He was for ever getting up meetings of bishops, and disturbing the peace of the Church.'⁶ 'Never,' he replies, 'during an episcopate of twenty-five years, have I attended a synod at Antioch, except in obedience to a summons.'⁷ Nevertheless, the charge was fatal; and, by an Imperial monition, addressed to Zeno, the commander of the forces in Syria, Theodoret was confined to his diocese, early in 448. He wrote to his friends to obtain redress—to the Patrician Anatolius, to the Prefect Eutrechius, to the Consular Nomus, and to Eusebius, bishop of Ancyra.⁸ 'In obedience to the Imperial

¹ *Ep.* lxxxiii (*Op.* iv. 1149; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1272 B).

² *Ibid.* (*Op.* iv. 1150 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1273 A).

³ *Ep.* lxxxvi (*Op.* iv. 1156; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1280 B).

⁴ *Ibid.* (*Op.* iv. 1157; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1280 c). On the meaning of 'Coryphaeus' and on Thdt.'s view of the authority of the Roman See see Newman's note in *Fléury*, xxvii. xvi (iii. 262, note h).

⁵ *Ibid.* (*Op.* iv. 1157 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1280 sq.).

⁶ *Epp.* lxxix, lxxx (*Op.* iv. 1134 sq., 1137; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1256 A, B, 1257 c).

⁷ *Ep.* lxxxi (*Op.* iv. 1140; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1262 A).

⁸ *Epp.* lxxix-lxxxii (*Op.* iv. 1134-44; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1255-66).

order,' he protests to Anatolius, 'I am now at Cyrus. Not that I take it ill to live here: it is the compulsion that I find so irksome.' 'Though a high-priest of twenty-five years' standing,' he reminds Eutrechius, 'I have been condemned unheard.' My sympathies with Irenaeus on his deposition and with 'the calamities of Phoenicia'¹ are, no doubt, the real reason why they are angry with me; but the charge, it appears—so he informs Nomus—is of assembling synods. As to that, 'neither under Theodotus, John, nor Domnus, have I ever been to Antioch uninvited; and, whenever I did go, it was in obedience to the canon which requires that one who is summoned to a synod and refuses to attend, shall be held guilty'. Theodoret then continues that any such behaviour as that imputed to him is incompatible with his whole past, his dedication to God from his cradle, his long episcopate—blameless, generous, full of missionary zeal.² To Eusebius he repudiates the charge of 'preaching two sons instead of One'. Indeed, he is of opinion that some of the Nicene Fathers went too far in the distinction they drew between God and man in Christ; and he concludes with giving a list of his works by way of defying his accusers to find in them anything contrary to Holy Scripture.³ But Theodoret chose some of his confidants badly. Nomus, for instance, paid no attention to his appeal: he was entirely at the service of Dioscorus and Eutyches. So it was all to no purpose; nor did anything come of the efforts of Domnus, seconded by Theodoret, to conciliate opinion at Constantinople in favour of Easterns by sheaves of letters showered upon persons about the Court.⁴

Eutyches and his party, therefore, were full of confidence. In the cases of Irenaeus, Ibas, and Theodoret in turn, they had given proof of enjoying the control of the Emperor and the support of Alexandria. One thing was wanting—the goodwill of Rome; and, in May 448, Eutyches wrote to inform the Pope that 'Nestorianism' was on the increase. But these 'Nestorians' were, in fact, Catholics⁵; and Leo cautiously replied, in *Ad notitiam*

¹ *Epp.* lxxix, lxxx (*Op.* iv. 1135 sq., 1138; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1256, 1260 A).

² *Ep.* lxxxi (*Op.* iv. 1140 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1261); Fleury, xxvii. xiii.

³ *Ep.* lxxxii (*Op.* iv. 1142-4; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1263-6).

⁴ Fleury, xxvii. xvii.

⁵ As is clear from a statement of Domnus, in a synodal letter to Theodosius II, where he gives a Catholic proposition as that which Eutyches denied, because he was renewing the tenets of Apollinarianism, Facundus, viii, § 5 (*P. L.* lxxvii. 723 sq.).

nostram of 1 June 448, with a request for more particular information.¹ Then, the situation changed ; and Eutyches found himself not plaintiff, but defendant.

§ 11. For, at the synod of Constantinople,² November 448, he was accused before his archbishop, Flavian.

The accuser was Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum 448-51, in Phrygia Salutaris. As a layman Eusebius had been the first to detect the nascent Nestorianism of 428, and to protest with zeal against it.³ He was ordained some three years later, and was now a bishop. He was also a friend of Eutyches, and had tried, as such, to reclaim him ; but in vain.⁴ At last, he proceeded to draw up an indictment against him.

Taking advantage of the Home Synod⁵ of about thirty bishops which now happened to be assembled with Flavian in order to deal with a difference between the metropolitan of Sardis and two of his suffragans, Eusebius presented his accusations, at the first session,⁶ on Monday, 8 November 448. The indictment⁷ contained no definite charge. But it was a surprise to Flavian,⁸ and the Synod agreed that Eutyches should be required to attend.⁹

At the second session,¹⁰ on Friday, 12 November, Eusebius repeated his charge ; and, at his suggestion,¹¹ the Synod caused to be read the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius [*Obloquuntur*],¹² with the approval given to it by the Council of Ephesus,¹³ and his letter to John [*Laetentur caeli*],¹⁴ passing over his third letter to Nestorius [*Cum Salvator*] with its anathematisms. On the motion of Eusebius,¹⁵ Flavian next required that all should assent to these declarations of faith¹⁶ ; and then proceeded to comment on them in a statement in which he confesses Christ as 'Of two natures',¹⁷ and adopts for the most part, though with slight alterations, the language of the *Formulary of Reunion*. The rest of the bishops

¹ Leo, *Ep.* xx (*Op.* i. 737 ; *P. L.* liv. 713) ; Jaffé, No. 418 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxiii.

² Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 493-517 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxiv-xxix ; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 518-38 (*E. Tr.* iii. 189-204).

³ Mansi, vi. 673 c ; Cyril, *adv. Nest.* i, § 4 (*Op.* ix. 20 ; *P. G.* lxxvi. 41 D).

⁴ Mansi, vi. 656 A.

⁵ On which, see Fleury, xxvii. xxiv, xxviii. xxxiii (iii. 273, note p, 406, note i) ; W. Bright, *Canons* ², 182.

⁶ The minutes of this Synod are embedded in the *acta* of the Co. of Chalcedon, Mansi, vi. 649 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. vi. 652 sq.

⁸ Ibid. 653 D.

⁹ Ibid. 656 D.

¹⁰ Ibid. 657 sqq.

¹¹ Ibid. 660 A.

¹² Ibid. 659-664.

¹³ Ibid. 665 sq.

¹⁴ Ibid. 665-74.

¹⁵ Ibid. 677 c, D.

¹⁶ Ibid. 677 D.

¹⁷ 'Εκ δύο φύσεων, ibid. 680 B.

followed ; and two of them, Basil, bishop of Seleucia and metropolitan of Isauria, with Seleucus, bishop of Amasea and metropolitan of Helenopontus, confessed Him, rather, as ' In two natures ' ¹ ; and it was as the minute of their vote was read at Chalcedon that Dioscorus professed himself ready to accept the former expression but not the latter. ²

In the third session, ³ of Monday, 15 November, the two clerics sent to summon Eutyches to attend, gave an account of their errand. ⁴ He declined to come, and wished the Synod to understand that Eusebius was his enemy. He was willing to reaffirm the decisions of Nicaea and Ephesus : if the Fathers there were at fault ' in any chance expression ', he could ignore that. For himself, he preferred ' to search the Scriptures by themselves, as being more certain than the exposition of the Fathers ' ; and, since the Incarnation, he adores but ' one nature ' of God incarnate. To say that He is ' of two natures united in [one] Person ' would be to affirm what he had not found in the Fathers ⁵ ; and what, if it were found, he would not receive ; for the Scriptures are of more value than any Fathers. He admitted, however, that He who was born of Mary was complete God and complete man ; but not that His manhood is consubstantial with ours. ⁶ The Synod thereupon summoned him a second time, but he pretended to be too old and weak to go ⁷ ; and a third citation ⁸ was sent, for Wednesday, 17 November.

Meanwhile, a fourth session ⁹ was held on Tuesday, 16 November, at which envoys from Eutyches appeared to say that he was ill and had had a sleepless night, and had sent them instead. Flavian assured them that he was willing to wait ; but that, as soon as Eutyches was well, he must appear, and would be sure of fatherly treatment. ¹⁰ Indeed, the archbishop's tone is the model of what a bishop's behaviour as judge should be ; and he ended, as the session rose, by a reproof to Eusebius. ' You know the zeal of the promoter,' said he to his colleagues : ' fire itself is cold to him.' ¹¹

The fifth session, ¹² of Wednesday, 17 November, to which

¹ 'Εν δύο φύσεσιν, *ibid.* 685 B, C. On the phrase see W. Bright, *St. Leo* ², 228.

² Mansi, vi. 692 A.

³ *Ibid.* 697 sqq.

⁴ *Ibid.* 700.

⁵ This is true : see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 104.

⁶ Mansi, vi. 700 B, D.

⁷ *Ibid.* 708 sq.

⁸ *Ibid.* 712 C, D.

⁹ *Ibid.* 712 sqq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 713.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 716 A.

¹² *Ibid.* 715 sqq.

Eutyches was to have answered in person was occupied with evidence of his stirring up the monks : and he did not come. But Flavian gave him till the Monday following, under pain of deposition if he did not put in an appearance then.¹

There was a sixth session² on Saturday, 20 November, when Eusebius urged that four of the friends of Eutyches should be summoned to appear on Monday as witnesses ; and went on to say that he had learned something of importance which was said in their hearing but did not find place in the minutes of what Eutyches had said to Mamas and Theophilus, the bearers of the second summons. So Theophilus was called and was asked what it was. 'Eutyches asked us,' he replied, 'in the presence of these witnesses, in what part of Scripture we found mention of "two natures"'. "Where can you find mention in Scripture", we retorted, "of the *Homoousion* ?" He admitted that our Lord is both complete God and complete man. "Then, why not", we demanded, "admit the two natures ?" "God forbid", was his reply, "that I should affirm Christ to be of two natures, or that I should speculate about the nature of my God."'³ And Mamas confirmed the depositions of his colleague.⁴ Flavian was now in full possession of the evidence, so far as it could be gathered from the lips of witnesses.

At the seventh session,⁵ of Monday, 22 November, the accused himself appeared. To add to the solemnity of the session, the Book of 'the Holy and Awful Gospels was set forth'⁶ upon the throne, to signify the presence of the Divine Master⁷; and Eutyches entered, escorted by soldiers, monks, and officers of the Praetorian Prefect. Then followed Magnus,⁸ one of the thirty *silentiarii*, in the department of the Provost of the Sacred Bed-chamber, whose office was to stand, in helmet and cuirass, outside the veil and keep inviolate the person of the Augustus.⁹ He represented his master, and brought with him an Imperial Letter¹⁰ appointing the Patrician, Florentius, to take part in the Synod. The letter was received with acclamations—'To the High-priest Emperor'¹¹—though neither its contents, nor the presence of

¹ Mansi, vi. 724 B, C.

² Ibid. 723 sqq.

³ Ibid. 725, 728.

⁴ Ibid. 728 sq.

⁵ Ibid. 729 sqq.

⁶ Ibid. 729 B.

⁷ This is the idea at the bottom of the ceremonies of the Little Entrance : see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies*, i. 367 ; A. Fortescue, *The Mass*, 283 sq.

⁸ Mansi, vi. 732 B.

⁹ Hodgkin, I. ii. 616.

¹⁰ Mansi, vi. 732 sq.

¹¹ Ibid. 733 A.

Florentius could, at first sight, seem acceptable to the Synod. Florentius, however, was admitted and, as a 'lay theologian',¹ took an active part in the proceedings; though, not being a bishop, he was not a constituent member of the Synod, and had no vote.² The proceedings began with a command that Eusebius and Eutyches should stand forth; and the minutes of the Council, to date, were read. When they came to the recital, from the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch, of 'complete God and complete man',³ Eutyches made no objection. In answer to a question put by Eusebius: 'Do you confess two natures after the Incarnation, my lord Archimandrite, and that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh, or not?'⁴ Eutyches tried at first to fence; but finally admitted, with some reluctance, that, as Mary was consubstantial with us, so her Son is consubstantial with us too, 'though he had never said as much before'.⁵ 'Tell us, then,' broke in the Patrician, Florentius, 'whether the Lord is of two natures after the Incarnation, or not.' 'I confess', replied Eutyches in a final avowal, 'that He was of two natures before the union; but, after the union, I confess but one.'⁶ It is difficult to be quite sure of what Eutyches meant. To say that 'our Lord was of two natures before the Incarnation' was, if not meaningless, nothing to the purpose; for the question turned on what he meant as to what our Lord is since the Incarnation. He could not have meant what Cyril meant by his phrase, 'One nature incarnate of God the Word': for Eutyches, in speaking of 'two natures before the union', clearly used φύσις in the sense of 'nature', not of 'person'. It remains that he contradicted himself, and went back upon his own admission of a Christ consubstantial with us, when he persisted that, since the union, there is but one nature after all. If this language meant anything, it meant that the human nature in Christ was, after the Incarnation, absorbed by the Divine. Not, of course, that at the Council Eutyches employed the language of absorption. If he had, he could have quoted similes from Catholic theologians in support.⁷ But it was a just inference, on the part of the Council, from his admissions, his

¹ Mansi, vi. 733 A.² W. Bright, *Letters*, 319, 323.³ Mansi, vi. 736 A.⁴ Ibid. 737 C.⁵ Ibid. 741 B.⁶ Ibid. 744 B, and Document No. 208.⁷ Greg. Nyss. *Epist. adv. Apoll. ad Theophilum episc. Al.* (Op. iii. 265; P. G. xlv. 1276 C, D); *Antirrheticus*, § 42 (P. G. xlv. 1224 A); *Contra Eunomium*, v (Op. ii. 591 A; P. G. xlv. 708 C).

hesitations, and his partisan antecedents, that his tenets were inconsistent with any real belief in the Incarnation and incompatible with the permanence of our Lord's true Manhood. Abandoning, therefore, any further attempts to reason with him, the Synod proceeded to his condemnation. He had gone back, said their sentence, not only to Apollinarianism but to Valentinianism¹—an imputation unjust to the man himself but nevertheless one which touched the vital point. For though Eutyches verbally admitted our Lord to be consubstantial with us, he would not draw the inference that, after the Union, there were two Natures in Christ, the human as real and as permanent as the Divine. It was therefore a just sentence, in the main; but, as to 'Two Natures'—the phrase which the Council required of him—he might feel himself aggrieved. Certainly it had authority; the way had been prepared for it by Athanasius²; it had been used by Gregory Nazianzen³; and the substance of it was the basis of the Reunion Creed. But the Council stretched its powers in enforcing it, under penalty, without explicit and universal authority; and this, as yet, it had not. Eutyches therefore, as the Synod broke up, was observed to fasten on that point. He would appeal, he said, to the Councils of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica.⁴ He could already rely on the second.⁵ We note the omission of Antioch: ranged, of course, on the other side. Domnus had already been in collision with Dioscorus; and had been the first to point out the heretical nature of the teaching of Eutyches.⁶

§ 12. Eutyches built most, no doubt, on Rome; and hence the correspondence with Leo, in which Flavian was to blame for giving Eutyches the start. Flavian, indeed, acquainted the Patriarch, Domnus of Antioch, with the sentence⁷; but did not write to Rome till the winter of 448-9. Eutyches, on the other hand, no sooner had received his sentence than, November 448, he appealed to Leo. 'I fly to you,' he wrote, 'the defender of religion, for assistance: conscious that I have never innovated on the Faith'; and he appended to his letter the *libellus* of his accuser and that which he himself had prepared in defence;

¹ Mansi, vi. 748 B.

² In the fragment on Phil. ii. 6, 7 (*Op.* ii. 1027; *P. G.* xxvi. 1256 sq.); and *Orat. c. Ar.* iii, § 53 (*Op.* ii. 477; *P. G.* xxvi. 436 A).

³ *Ep.* ci (*Op.* iii. 85; *P. G.* xxxvii. 180 A).

⁴ Mansi, vi. 817 c.

⁵ *Ibid.* 820 A.

⁶ Fleury, xxvii. xxix (iii. 285, note r).

⁷ Mansi, vi. 836 A.

his profession of faith, and a list of some passages from the Fathers in support of it.¹ 'Chrysaphius took care that the case of Eutyches thus presented to Leo should be seconded by a letter to the Pope from Theodosius himself²; while Eutyches also took the precaution of soliciting the aid of Peter Chrysologus, archbishop of Ravenna, 433-†49, the city of Valentinian III and the Western Court.³ Early in 449 the Western prelates sent off their replies to these entreaties. 'The archbishop of Ravenna advised Eutyches obediently to await the letters of Leo; for 'blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, guarantees the truth of the faith to those who [thus] seek it'.⁴ The Petrine theory, as put into final shape by Leo, was thus clearly accepted by some of the most distinguished of his contemporaries. Then, on 18 February, were dispatched letters of the Pope, to Flavian and to the Emperor. In *Cum Christianissimus*⁵ to his brother of Constantinople, he expresses his surprise that Flavian had not been the first to let him know of what had happened: so far as he could judge from the statement of Eutyches, an injustice had been done: he would therefore be glad of full information; and in *Quantum praesidii*⁶ he gave Theodosius to understand that he was displeased with the silence of Flavian and expected a full report. The report arrived, shortly after Leo had sent off these two epistles, in the shape of Flavian's first letter⁷ to the Pope. He gave him an account of the trial of Eutyches, accusing him, incorrectly, of renewing the errors of Valentinus and Apollinaris⁸; and he ended by begging Leo to inform the bishops of the West that Eutyches had been duly deprived and excommunicated. This letter Leo merely acknowledged by *Pervenisse ad nos*⁹ of 21 May, in which he foreshadows the coming *Tome*. It was already in preparation, and was sent off to Flavian, as *Lectis dilectionis tuae*¹⁰ of 13 June,

¹ The letter of Eutyches ranks as Leo, *Ep.* xxi (*Op.* i. 739-43; *P. L.* liv. 713-18); Fleury, xxvii. xxxi.

² So Leo, *Ep.* xxiv (*Op.* i. 767 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 735 sq.) of 18 Feb. 449.

³ For a description of Ravenna, as the capital of Galla Placidia and her son Valentinian III, see Hodgkin, i. ii. 850 sqq.

⁴ Leo, *Ep.* xxv, § 2 (*Op.* i. 779; *P. L.* liv. 743 A); Fleury, xxvii. xxxvii.

⁵ *Ep.* xxiii (*Op.* i. 762-6; *P. L.* liv. 731-6); Jaffé, No. 420; Fleury, xxvii. xxxi.

⁶ *Ep.* xxiv (*Op.* i. 767 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 735 sq.); Jaffé, No. 421; Fleury, xxvii. xxxi.

⁷ Leo, *Ep.* xxii (*Op.* i. 752-62; *P. L.* liv. 723-32).

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* i. 756; *P. L.* liv. 725 A).

⁹ *Ep.* xxvii (*Op.* i. 792; *P. L.* liv. 751 sq.); Jaffé, No. 422.

¹⁰ *Ep.* xxviii (*Op.* i. 801-38; *P. L.* liv. 755-82); Jaffé, No. 423; Fleury, xxvii. xxxv, and Document No. 209.

containing the Pope's matured judgement. We will examine its contents when we come to the reception that awaited it at the Council of Chalcedon. Scarcely had the post which took it left, than a second letter from Flavian¹ arrived in Rome, complaining that Eutyches was placarding his wrongs all over Constantinople and petitioning the Emperor; let Leo therefore confirm in writing the condemnation pronounced against him, and so, by letting the Emperor see that West and East were at one, do his part to prevent the Council. The rumour of it has already got abroad. It is certain to disturb all the churches of the earth. The Pope had already pronounced on the merits of the question by the *Tome*; and the appeal to declare a Council unnecessary came home to willing ears. He replied, 20 June, that, in his view, there was no need of a synod to handle the matter further.² But it was too late. Neither Flavian nor Leo could prevent it. For Eutyches had made interest again at Court; and, by *Cunctis constitit*³ of 30 March, Theodosius had summoned a Council to meet at Ephesus, 1 August 449, which has gone down to history as the *Latrocinium* or Robber-Council of Ephesus.

¹ *Ep.* xxvi (*Op.* i. 781-91; *P. L.* liv. 743-52); Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.

² Leo, *Ep.* xxxvi (*Op.* i. 885; *P. L.* liv. 809-11).

³ Mansi, vi. 587-90.

⁴ 'In illo Ephesino non iudicio sed latrocinio,' Leo, *Ep.* xcv, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1077; *P. L.* liv. 943 B).

CHAPTER XV

THE LATROCINIUM, 449

§ 1. BEFORE the Council of Ephesus¹ assembled, there was much manœuvring to secure the advantage so soon as it met.

The petitions, of which Flavian complained to Leo, began with one addressed by Eutyches to the Emperor, demanding a scrutiny of the minutes of the Home Synod at Constantinople, on the ground that they had been falsified.² By order of Theodosius,³ they were submitted to a Council at Constantinople, 8 April 449, for verification; but no inaccuracy of importance was discovered.⁴ Another petition procured from the Emperor an order of 27 April that Flavian should produce a written statement of his faith. 'It was strange enough', says Tillemont, 'that this prince should thus make himself a judge of the faith of his archbishop; but Flavian made no objection on that score.'⁵ 'Nothing is so befitting a bishop', he replied, 'as to be ready to give to every one that asketh a reason of the faith that is in us': and then follows a doctrinal statement⁶ which closely resembles his oral creed of 12 November 448. In this statement he declares his adhesion to the faith of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus, thus intimating his belief that the second of these had something to do with a recension of the Nicene Creed, and disclaiming all sympathy with Nestorianism. He acknowledges Christ after the Incarnation as 'in two natures', but also as 'in one Person'; and he does not refuse to speak of 'one nature of God the Word' provided that 'incarnate and made man' be added.⁷ It is a confession which (a) is indebted to the *Formulary of Reunion*, and (b) is a contribution to the *Chalcedonian Definition*. But whereas the former spoke

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 527-85; Fleury, xxxvii. xxxiv-xli; Gibbon, c. xlvii (v. 121 sqq.); Hefele, *Conciles*, II. i. 555-621 (E. Tr. iii. 221-62); P. Martin, *Le brigandage d'Éphèse* (Paris, 1875); S. G. F. Perry, *The second Synod of Ephesus* (Dartford, 1881); and note in Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 419, n. 2.

² Mansi, vi. 763-6.

³ Ibid. 757 B.

⁴ Ibid. 757 D; Liberatus, *Brev.* xi (P. L. lxxviii. 1000 sq.).

⁵ *Mém.* xv. 521 sq.

⁶ q.v. in Mansi, vi. 540-2; Liberatus, *Brev.* xi (P. L. lxxviii. 1001); A. Hahn³, *Symbole*, 320; T. H. Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 238.

⁷ Mansi, vi. 541 B.

of the Lord as 'consubstantial with us', Flavian only confesses Him as 'consubstantial with His Mother'¹; and it is extremely probable that, as at the Home Synod, what he acknowledged on this occasion was 'of two natures', and that the text has since been altered to accord with the more precise and Chalcedonian formula 'in two natures'. So Eutyches avenged himself by petitions.

But, meanwhile, Chrysaphius had done his part. He promised his aid to Dioscorus, if he would undertake the defence of his godfather, and attack Flavian. He also prevailed on the Empress Eudocia to act on the same side, if only to spite her sister-in-law, Pulcheria.² Eutyches also entreated Dioscorus to take his part. The archbishop of Alexandria, only too glad to have a handle against his brother of Constantinople, responded at once to these appeals. He admitted the excommunicated Eutyches to his communion³; he wrote to the Emperor that the only remedy lay in a General Council; and his admonition, supported, so soon as it arrived, by the concerted approval of the Empress and Chrysaphius, took speedy effect in the letter of summons already mentioned. It was addressed to Dioscorus, under date 30 March 449. It bade each patriarch or exarch to bring ten metropolitans and ten other bishops with him, and to hasten to Ephesus by 1 August next; and it forbade Theodoret, already confined to his see, to enter the Council⁴—no doubt, as the most formidable opponent of anything monophysite in tendency. In April, Theodosius would hear, from the Report of Count Chaereas, that Ibas had been no less conveniently disposed of. His next step was, by a stretch of prerogative peculiarly Byzantine, to write, 14 May, to a very zealous anti-Nestorian abbot Barsumas [Bar-Saumâ], †458, and command him to repair to Ephesus and take his seat—the first abbot to do so—in a General Council as representative of the abbots of 'the East': or rather—for this is the inner meaning of the order—as representative of a body of opinion, monastic and lay, in revolt against the 'Nestorianism' of the 'Oriental' bishops.⁵ Next,

¹ Mansi, vi. 541 B.

² Nicephorus Callistus [*fl.* 1320–30], *Eccl. Hist.* xiv, § 47 (*P. G.* cxlvi. 1225 A, B); Fleury, xxvii. xxxiv (N. C. was the last of the Greek ecclesiastical historians. His history, in eighteen books, brings the record down to A. D. 610. He is dependent on his predecessors for the first four centuries; for the fifth onward he becomes more valuable, because he used sources now lost, *Enc. Br.*¹¹ xi. 648).

³ Mansi, vi. 1045 c, 1099 A.

⁴ *Ibid.* 587–90.

⁵ *Ibid.* 593 c.

15 May, Theodosius wrote to Dioscorus to inform him that the archimandrite Barsumas was thus to sit and vote:¹ A third Imperial missive to Dioscorus bears no date, but reminds him of the previous prohibition of Theodoret's attendance. 'We abhor him,' says the Emperor, 'because of his opposition to Cyril of blessed memory'—as if Theodosius himself had not been as keen an opponent of 'the Egyptian'—'and lest efforts should be made to get him admitted to the Synod, we appoint you to supreme control thereof: assured, as we are, that Juvenal and Thalassius and ample support will be with you'.² He also appointed Elpidius, Count of the Sacred Consistory,³ i.e. as we should say, Lord President of the Privy Council, and Eulogius, Tribune and Notary, as Imperial Commissioners to maintain good order.⁴ He directed Proclus, Proconsul of Asia, to aid them in their task⁵; and, finally, gave proof of his *animus* by writing to the Synod and saying that Flavian had stirred up the business: he had, therefore, summoned them to expel from the Church all adherents of Nestorianism, and to maintain the faith.⁶ Byzantinism, again: to dictate a foregone conclusion to a General Council!

The sympathies of the Emperor were thus abundantly clear when, about 13 May 449, his summons to Pope Leo to attend the Council reached Rome.⁷ The Pope, by this time, had received Flavian's report on the situation, and was convinced that Eutyches was in error. What, then, was the use of a General Council? But there was no help for it, as 'the commandment and will of Princes' insisted; and, after a brief note, of 21 May, to Flavian promising him support,⁸ Leo bowed to the Emperor's will and, in *Quantum rebus*⁹ of 13 June, informed him that 'as he had appointed a synodical trial for Eutyches to take place at Ephesus', the Apostolic See would be represented by his legates, Julius, bishop of Puteoli, Renatus, a presbyter, Hilary, a deacon (who afterwards succeeded him as Pope, 461–†8), and the notary Dulcitius. They left Rome before 23 June, and carried with them the celebrated *Tome* to Flavian.¹⁰ It was a condemnation not only

¹ Mansi, vi. 593 A, B.² Ibid. 600 B–D.³ Hodgkin, i. ii. 617.⁴ Mansi, vi. 595 sq.⁵ Ibid. 597 sq.⁶ Ibid. 597–600.⁷ Leo, *Ep.* xxxi, § 4 (*Op.* i. 856; *P. L.* liv. 793 B).⁸ *Ep.* xxvii (*Op.* i. 792; *P. L.* liv. 751 sq.); Jaffé, No. 422.⁹ *Ep.* xxix (*Op.* i. 839; *P. L.* liv. 783); Jaffé, No. 424; Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.¹⁰ *Ep.* xxviii (*Op.* i. 801–38; *P. L.* liv. 755–82); Jaffé, No. 423; Fleury, xxvii. xxxv.

of Eutyches but of Alexandrian theory as then held ; for, dyophysite in basis, it followed the Christology expounded in the *Formula of Reunion* and by Flavian. They also took their own credentials, and letters ¹ for Pulcheria—*Quantum sibi* and *Quantum praesidii*—assuring her that the point at issue is vital : for the archimandrites of Constantinople—*Cum propter causam* ² ; for the Synod—*Religiosa clementissimi* ³ ; and two ⁴—*Litterae dilectionis tuae* and *Licet per nostris*—to the Pope's representative at Constantinople, Julian, bishop of Cos 448–58. It was important that he should be carefully briefed, for, whereas the Pope's legates understood Latin only, Julian knew both Greek and Latin equally well. Such, then, were the contents of the legates' letter-bag ; and, in each epistle, Leo referred his correspondent for greater detail to the considered judgement of his *Tome*.

§ 2. The Council opened,⁵ about a week after the date for which it had been summoned, in ' the church called Mary ' ⁶ at Ephesus, where the Third Oecumenical Council had met eighteen years before. Dioscorus presided, with about a hundred and thirty bishops, for the most part devoted to his cause. Next to the President sat the greater prelates in order of seniority and without regard to the rank of their Sees—Julius, the papal legate, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, Flavian of Constantinople ⁷ ; then the bishops ⁸ ; then the abbot, Barsumas ⁹ ; and last of all (for the legate Renatus had died on the way) the deacon Hilary and the notary Dulcitius.¹⁰ One is surprised, perhaps, that the papal legates accepted Dioscorus as president, when they themselves were present. But they could not help themselves : it was the Emperor's will. Further, they would have made but poor presidents, as they neither spoke nor understood the language of the Council ; and, also, there was precedent against them. At

¹ *Epp.* xxx, xxxi (*Op.* i. 847–58 ; *P. L.* liv. 785–96) ; Jaffé, No. 425 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.

² *Ep.* xxxii (*Op.* i. 859–62 ; *P. L.* liv. 795–8) ; Jaffé, No. 426 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.

³ *Ep.* xxxiii (*Op.* i. 863–8 ; *P. L.* liv. 797–800) ; Jaffé, No. 427 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.

⁴ *Epp.* xxxiv, xxxv (*Op.* i. 869–83 ; *P. L.* liv. 801–10) ; Jaffé, Nos. 428–9 ; Fleury, xxvii. xxxvi.

⁵ See its *acta* embedded in those of Chalcedon in Mansi, vi. 605 sqq. ; Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xii (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1003 sqq.).

⁶ Mansi, vi. 605 D.

⁷ Ibid. 608 A.

⁸ Ibid. 608 C–612 B.

⁹ Ibid. 612 B.

¹⁰ *Breviculus historiae Eutychianistarum*, in Mansi, vii. 1061 c, or *P. L.* lxxviii.

the first Council of Ephesus Cyril had presided in his own right, and had not even troubled himself to await the arrival of the pope's legates. And, so far from presiding, the legates at the *Latrocinium* played but a sorry part; they raised honourable protests and did their utmost, it is true. But, as they were seated at some distance from each other, they could not act in concert. And, as they understood with difficulty, notwithstanding the help of their episcopal interpreter Florentius,¹ what was being said, they could not intervene with effect. So Dioscorus had it all his own way.

§ 3. At the first session, 8 August,² he proceeded at once to the rehabilitation of Eutyches and the deposition of Flavian. He began by reducing forty-two prelates—those who had taken part in the condemnation of Eutyches—to the *status* of mere spectators in the Council.³ The Imperial writ of convocation was then read⁴ in due form; and the papal legates, after affirming that Leo had been duly summoned, explained that he would certainly have obeyed the summons in person had there been precedent; but precedent was the other way. 'He therefore gave us, as his representatives, letters which we desire to have read.'⁵ But Dioscorus had already contrived that the reading should not take place, on the plea that there were other Imperial letters to hear,⁶ viz. the letter enjoining that the abbot Barsumas should sit and vote; and the Council passed, in obedience to the Emperor's instructions, to the question of faith⁷—Was Eutyches rightly condemned by Flavian? Eutyches was introduced,⁸ and handed in his profession of Faith⁹: whereupon the Council proceeded to the reading of the minutes of the Synod which had tried and condemned him,¹⁰ disregarding both the demand of Flavian that Eusebius, the promoter of the suit against Eutyches, should be heard,¹¹ and the reiterated request of the papal legates that Leo's letters should be taken first.¹² The reader came to the minutes of 12 November 448, where the two metropolitans, Basil and Seleucus, had confessed 'One Lord in two natures'.¹³ Blood began to boil. But, when he reached the place in the final session,

¹ Mansi, vi. 613 B.

² It may all have happened on one and the same day, Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 418, n. 1.

³ Mansi, vi. 605 A.

⁴ Ibid. 613 A.

⁵ Ibid. 613-16.

⁶ Ibid. 616 A.

⁷ Ibid. 621 B.

⁸ Ibid. 628 C.

⁹ Ibid. 629 B-632 B, 639 A-644 A.

¹⁰ Ibid. 645 C.

¹¹ Ibid. 644 B, 645 A, B.

¹² Ibid. 649 A.

¹³ Ibid. 685 B.

22 November, where Eusebius pressed Eutyches to acknowledge the two natures after the Incarnation, the Council broke out into fury:—‘ Out with him ! burn Eusebius ! burn him alive ! let him be torn in two ! as he has divided, let him be divided ! ’¹ The creed of Eutyches, ‘ Two natures before the union ; one only, after it ’, received loud assent. ‘ That is the belief of us all,’ pronounced Dioscorus² ; and, at his invitation,³ the bishops present, beginning with Juvenal⁴ and Domnus,⁵ gave sentence, in turn, in favour of Eutyches. His orthodoxy was reaffirmed ; he was restored to his rank of presbyter and archimandrite⁶ ; and his monks were absolved and re-established.⁷ Thus the first part of the Council’s project was accomplished ; it only remained to carry through the second and dispose of Flavian. With this end in view, Dioscorus next proposed⁸ the recital of the minutes of the sixth session of the former Council at Ephesus,⁹ respecting the Faith, 22 July 431. They forbade, he explained, ‘ the putting forth of any other faith than that of Nicaea as reaffirmed by that Council of Ephesus. But this is exactly what Flavian and Eusebius have done : they are therefore deposed.’¹⁰ ‘ I disclaim your authority,’ cried Flavian. ‘ We oppose it,’ exclaimed Hilary, the papal legate.¹¹ But, at the bidding of the president, the rest, beginning with Juvenal of Jerusalem, confirmed his verdict, one by one.¹² Yet not without pressure. Dioscorus had scarcely begun to give sentence, when a knot of prelates seized him and begged him not to proceed. ‘ Where are the Counts ? ’¹³ he shouted. In rushed the soldiery ; and, while Dioscorus was shouting, ‘ Look you : he that will not sign against Flavian, will have to reckon with me ’,¹⁴ signatures¹⁵ were obtained under military compulsion—even from the unhappy Domnus. It was a good day’s work from the point of view of Dioscorus ; and, the first session thus over, he sent in his report to the Emperor.

§ 4. A fortnight elapsed before the Council met again on 22 August,¹⁶ in the absence of Flavian and Eusebius, of the Roman legates and of Domnus. The two first had been thrown into prison ;

¹ Mansi, vi. 737 C.

² Ibid. 744 B.

³ Ibid. 833 D.

⁴ Ibid. 836 A.

⁵ Ibid. 836 A, B. No mention is made of the papal legates having given any such sentence. Barsumas, who could only speak Syriac, gave his vote by an interpreter, *ibid.* 861 B.

⁶ Ibid. 861 B.

⁷ Ibid. 861–70.

⁸ Ibid. 869 B.

⁹ Ibid. 871–902.

¹⁰ Ibid. 908 B, C.

¹¹ Ibid. 908 D.

¹² Ibid. 909 A–928 C.

¹³ Ibid. 832 B.

¹⁴ Ibid. 829 B.

¹⁵ Ibid. 927 C–936 A.

¹⁶ P. Martin, *Le brigandage d’Éphèse*, 174.

and Flavian actually died,¹ at Hypepe in Lydia, of the kicks and blows he had received from Barsumas and his monks.² The legates refused to attend again ; and Hilary, after great difficulty, effected his escape and found his way back to Rome by devious routes.³ Domnus was ill. The opposition thus crushed, or cowed, it lay open to Dioscorus to round off his triumph ; and the remaining sessions were devoted to settling accounts with the Patriarchate of Antioch. He began with Ibas, who was deposed, with his nephew Daniel, bishop of Carrhae.⁴ Then he turned to Irenaeus, metropolitan of Tyre, who had recovered his see since he was turned out of it by the Rescript of 16 February 448, and whom he deprived, together with his suffragan, Aquilinus, bishop of Byblus.⁵ Last came the turn of Theodoret : he, too, was got rid of.⁶ These sentences were notified to Domnus, and he weakly gave his consent. But this did not save him. The Synod pronounced him contumacious, and deposed him.⁷ Then, to put a finish on its proceedings, it solemnly ratified the Twelve Articles of Cyril.⁸ A sorry triumph for Cyril, in such company.

§ 5. Scarcely was it achieved when the reaction began,⁹ which led to the revision of the proceedings of the *Latrocinium* at Chalcedon. The reaction covered the years 449–51 ; and Pope Leo placed himself at the head of it.

(1) He received an appeal, or petition for help,¹⁰ from Theodoret,¹¹ whose exclusion from the Council left him the more free to seek aid of 'the powers that be'. After, § 1, acknowledging the pre-eminence of the Roman See, and, § 2, thanking Leo both for his zeal against the Manichees and his *Tome* to Flavian, Theodoret, § 3, complained of the injustice of Dioscorus, who had condemned him in absence. 'Six and twenty years, § 4, have I been a bishop ; and never have I incurred any censure from my superiors at

¹ Prosper, *Chron.* (*Op.* 750 ; *P. L.* li. 602 A) ; on the authorities, see L. Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 422, n. 2.

² Mansi, vii. 68 B.

³ Leo, *Ep.* xlvi (*Op.* i. 928 ; *P. L.* liv. 837 B) ; and note the chapel in the baptistery of the Lateran, with its inscription which Hilary, when Pope, put up, in remembrance of his escape, to the honour of his 'liberator, St John the Evangelist'—still to be seen there, Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 420, n. 1.

⁴ P. Martin, *Le brigandage*, 174 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 183 sqq.

⁶ Ibid. 186 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. 196 sqq.

⁸ Ibid. 206.

⁹ Fleury, xxvii. xli, xliii, xlv, xlvi–xlix, li.

¹⁰ That this, and no more, was the nature of the appeal, see E. Denny, *Papalism*, § 733.

¹¹ Fleury, xxvii. xlv ; Thdt. *Ep.* cxiii (*Op.* iv. 1187–92 ; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1311–18), and Document No. 224.

Antioch. I have won back Marcionites by the hundred ; Arians and Eunomians by the score. There is not one heretic in all the eight hundred parishes of my diocese ; and much of my labour has been at personal risk. My writings, § 5, testify, in no less degree, to the soundness of my faith. Do not, therefore, reject my petition ; but, § 6, tell me whether I am to acquiesce in my unjust deposition ; for I await your decision. Messengers, § 7, are taking this for me, though I would gladly come myself ; but that, by the Emperor's orders, I am confined to my diocese. This letter to the Pope was supported by others, in the same strain, to his *entourage* ; one to Renatus (of whose death Theodoret was, as yet, unaware), in which he acknowledges ' the hegemony of the holy throne of Rome over the churches of the world ', not, indeed, on the ground ' that the office of Supreme Pastor belongs *iure divino* to the Roman Bishop ',¹ but on account of the purity of its faith which was ' never ', he says, ' sullied by heresy ' ² ; a second, to Florentius,³ apparently as representative of the Western bishops assembled in synod at Rome with Leo ; a third,⁴ to the archdeacon, Hilary, of whose function at Ephesus, however, Theodoret appears to be ignorant ; and a fourth to Anatolius the Patrician,⁵ begging him to use his influence with the Emperor and so gain permission for the writer either ' to go to the West and there be judged by the bishops of those parts ', or else to return to his monastery, one hundred and twenty miles from Cyrus, seventy-five from Antioch, and three from Apamea. Leave to retire to his convent was given him ; and, meanwhile, his complaints were received in Rome. They were supplemented by the firsthand accounts of Hilary, who brought with him a written appeal from Flavian,⁶ while a similar document reached the Pope from Eusebius of Dorylaeum, being presented by two of his clergy. Flavian urges Leo ' to arise up first in the cause of our right faith ' ⁷ by ' issuing a decree ' for the

¹ Denny, *Papalism*, § 731. On ' hegemony ' as distinct from ' supremacy ', remember that Milan as well as Rome had a hegemony at this epoch, *ibid.*, § 1178.

² Thdt. *Ep.* cxvi (*Op.* iv. 1197 ; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 1325 A).

³ *Ep.* cxvii (*Op.* iv. 1198 sq. ; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 1325-8).

⁴ *Ep.* cxviii (*Op.* iv. 1199 sq. ; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 1327 sq.).

⁵ *Ep.* cxix (*Op.* iv. 1200-3) ; *P. L.* lxxxiii. 1327-30).

⁶ This *Appellatio Flaviani* is printed as No. LXX of the Church Historical Society's pamphlets (S.P.C.K. 1903), ed. T. A. Lacey. ' It was addressed to the Apostolic See and its synod (ib. 50), not to Leo as supreme judge of the faithful, having *iure divino* supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church ', Denny, *Papalism*, § 728.

⁷ *App. Fl.* 51.

assembling of a new Council both of West and East, and for the quashing of what had been done at Ephesus 'by a sort of gamester's trick'.¹ Eusebius presses him to take action in support of the intervention of his legates at Ephesus who had demanded in vain from Dioscorus that he, as well as Eutyches, plaintiff as well as defendant, should be heard²; and he begs to be 'restored to the episcopal dignity and your communion'.³

(2) A Council in Rome⁴ was celebrating the anniversary, 29 September 449, of the Pope's consecration when these appeals arrived. They discussed the situation; and, in their name or in his own, 13-15 October, Leo dispatched seven letters⁵ in all to protest against the recent proceedings of the Council of Ephesus. The first two were addressed to the Sovereigns of the East: to Theodosius, of whom he requests that all may remain *in statu quo ante*, until its doings are revised by a General Council in Italy; and to Pulcheria, whom he begs to support this request to her brother. In the third, he addresses himself to his Vicar, Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica 435-†51, whose proxy at Ephesus had voted with the majority. 'It is a good thing', says Leo, 'that you were not there: but I trust you will clear yourself of any sympathy with what was done.' Then followed the fourth, to Julian, bishop of Cos; the fifth, to Flavian; the sixth, to the clergy and people of Constantinople; and the seventh, to its monks. The purport of all was the same: 'Stand fast.' But nothing came of these endeavours that autumn. The creatures of Dioscorus were well ensconced in the thrones of Flavian and Domnus; for Anatolius⁶ ruled at Constantinople, 449-†58, and Maximus at Antioch, 449-†55; and, though the Pope wrote again to the Emperor⁷ at Christmas, the situation remained unchanged.

(3) Early in 450 the Western Court paid a visit to Rome,⁸ to take part in the feast of the Chair of St. Peter, 22 February⁹; and Leo contrived to turn the incident to account. At his suggestion, the Emperor Valentinian III, his mother Galla Placidia, and his wife Eudoxia, each wrote¹⁰ to their eastern kinsfolk. All in vain.

¹ *App. Fl.* 52. ² *Ibid.* 56. ³ *Ibid.* 58. ⁴ Fleury, xxvii. xliii.

⁵ Leo, *Epp.* xlv, xlv, xlvii-li (*Op.* i. 910-40; *P. L.* liv. 827-46); Jaffé, Nos. 438-44.

⁶ He wrote, announcing his election, to Leo, in Leo, *Ep.* liii (*Op.* i. 953-6; *P. L.* liv. 853-5).

⁷ Leo, *Ep.* liv (*Op.* i. 956-8; *P. L.* liv. 855 sq.); Jaffé, No. 445.

⁸ Fleury, xxvii. xlvi.

⁹ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 421, n. 2.

¹⁰ Leo, *Epp.* lv-lviii (*Op.* i. 962-74; *P. L.* liv. 857-65).

Theodosius had but just issued a rescript,¹ confirming everything that was done at Ephesus. He sent frigid replies to the Pope² and to the Emperor and the princesses of Ravenna³; assuring them that all had passed off well at the Council and that, since the removal of Flavian, peace had reigned in the East without injury to the Faith. There was nothing to be done: though Leo kept open an avenue for further action, whenever possible, by correspondence, 17 March, with Pulcheria,⁴ and by offering, 16–17 July, to recognize Anatolius⁵ on condition of his accepting Cyril's second letter to Nestorius [*Obloquuntur*] and his own *Tome* to Flavian. There was no response; and the prospect looked as dark as could be for the Catholic Faith.

§ 6. Then, by accident or by special providence, Theodosius II fell from his horse, and died,⁶ 28 July 450. At once the whole situation, political and ecclesiastical, was reversed, and the way was open to correct the Council of Ephesus by the Council of Chalcedon.

¹ Chalc. iii. No. 10 (Mansi, vii. 495–8).

² Not extant.

³ Leo, *Epp.* lxii–lxiv (*Op.* i. 987–92; *P. L.* liv. 875–9).

⁴ *Ep.* lx (*Op.* i. 982 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 873–4).

⁵ *Epp.* lxix–lxxi (*Op.* i. 1005–14; *P. L.* liv. 890–6); Jaffé, Nos. 452–4; Fleury, xxvii. xlv.

⁶ Fleury, xxvii. xlvii; Gibbon, c. xxxiv (iii. 444); Hodgkin, ii. 97.

CHAPTER XVI

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, 451

THEODOSIUS II left no children, and was succeeded by his sister, Pulcheria, 450–†3; ‘under whom’, says Gibbon, ‘the Romans, for the first time, submitted to a female reign.’¹

§ 1. Pulcheria inaugurated the reaction against the *Latrocinium*, whereas Leo had been able to do no more than urge it.

(1) Her first act was to put to death the eunuch Chrysaphius ; and so, while depriving the Eutychian party of all secular support, to establish herself in popular favour : for Chrysaphius had been a venal and oppressive minister. Her next care was to provide for the Empire.

As a woman, she hardly felt equal to sustaining alone the weight of its responsibilities : moreover, she was in her fifty-second year, and no longer young. So, reserving her virginity, she bestowed her hand in marriage on the senator Marcian, a soldier of experience, six years her senior, and in great esteem. She herself, as the representative of the Theodosian tradition, invested him with the Imperial insignia, 24 August 450. Marcian was as orthodox as Pulcheria. Under the late régime she had kept her own counsel. But she was known to have befriended Flavian, and to have kept up correspondence with Leo.

(2) It was, perhaps, for this reason—because he knew that he might now count on the Eastern Court—that Leo’s zeal to redress the wrongs done at Ephesus by another Council began to cool. He would also reflect that, if there was to be a Council, as the two Emperors, Valentinian and Marcian, desired,² the prospect of holding it, as he had proposed, in Italy, where he might control it, would be fainter under an Emperor like Marcian, who knew his own mind,³ than under the weak rule of Theodosius II. Further, things seemed to be going well without it ; for the fall of Chrysa-

¹ Gibbon, c. xxxiv (iii. 444).

² In the letter of September 450, in which Marcian announces his accession, *Conc. Chalc.* i. 33 (Mansi, vi. 93 sq.)=Leo, *Ep.* lxxiii (*Op.* i. 1018 sq. ; *P. L.* liv. 899 sq.) ; Fleury, xxvii. xlvii.

³ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 34 (Mansi, vi. 99)=Leo, *Ep.* lxxvi (*Op.* i. 1025 sq. ; *P. L.* liv. 903–6) ; and so, too, Pulcheria in *Conc. Chalc.* i. 35 (Mansi, vi. 102 D)=Leo, *Ep.* lxxvii (*Op.* i. 1031 ; *P. L.* liv. 907 A).

phius was a crushing blow to the party of Eutyches, and eastern clerics were showing themselves sensitive to the way the wind was now blowing at Court.¹ Eutyches was put under restraint. The body of Flavian was brought back home; and laid to rest, with great pomp, alongside of Emperors and Bishops in the Church of the Apostles.² The victims of Dioscorus and his Synod, including Theodoret,³ were recalled from exile⁴; while its members protested that they had acted under compulsion, and repudiated their share in its proceedings. Anatolius also, at a Council of Constantinople, received with effusion Abundius of Como; 450-†69, and his fellow-envoys from Leo; and not only signed the *Tome*, but busied himself to get other signatures.⁵ Maximus of Antioch proved equally complaisant. Dioscorus alone stood out. Conscious that his ascendancy had received a fatal check, he hired persons, so it was said, to stop the proclamation in Alexandria of the accession of Marcian. Such, then, was the situation, as Leo gathered it from letters of Marcian and Pulcheria,⁶ written 22 November 450 and delivered to him by the envoys⁷ of Anatolius and his Council. Briefly acknowledging the Emperor's letter,⁸ he wrote,⁹ 13 April 451, to Pulcheria and to Anatolius, suggesting that the latter should consult with his legates about the terms on which the rank and file at Ephesus were to be restored to communion¹⁰: the real authors of the mischief are Dioscorus and his abettors, Juvenal and Eustathius, bishop of Berytus (Beyrout).¹¹ To Marcian he added, 23 April, that the only question for further discussion was not the Faith but the terms on which those who had compromised it should come in.¹² These communications, however, produced no reply from the potentates, civil and ecclesiastical, of Constantinople. So, 9 June, the Pope addressed them again. To the Emperor¹³ he observed that a Council, in face of the

¹ e. g. Anatolius accepted the *Tome*; so Pulcheria to Leo, in Leo, *Ep.* lxxvii (*Op.* i. 1030; *P. L.* liv. 906 sq.).

² *Ibid.* (*Op.* i. 1032; *P. L.* liv. 907 A).

³ *Thdt. Epp.* cxxxviii-cxl (*Op.* iv. 1229-35; *P. G.* lxxxiii. 1359-64).

⁴ *Ibid.* (*Op.* i. 1032; *P. L.* liv. 907 B).

⁵ Fleury, xxvii. xlviii.

⁶ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 34, 35 (Leo, *Epp.* lxxvi, lxxvii), *ut sup.*

⁷ Leo, *Ep.* lxxx, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1039; *P. L.* liv. 913 B).

⁸ *Ep.* lxxviii (*Op.* i. 1033-5; *P. L.* liv. 907-9); Jaffé, No. 458.

⁹ *Epp.* lxxix, lxxx (*Op.* i. 1035-41; *P. L.* liv. 909-15); Jaffé, Nos. 459, 460.

¹⁰ *Ep.* lxxx, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1039 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 914 A).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* i. 1040; *P. L.* liv. 914 C).

¹² *Ep.* lxxxii, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1045; *P. L.* liv. 918 B); Jaffé, No. 462.

¹³ *Ep.* lxxxiii (*Op.* i. 1046 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 919-21); Jaffé, No. 463.

invasion of the Huns, was out of the question.¹ To Pulcheria² he announced his dispatch of a second legation to deal with the lapsed; and of Anatolius³ he requested that he would co-operate with his envoys in rehabilitating the offenders. After all, it was the 'malice of Dioscorus and the ignorance of Juvenal'⁴ that led to all the trouble; they might be left to the judgement of the Apostolic See⁵; the rest could be dealt with on the spot.⁶ It is interesting to note that Leo carefully avoids putting down to Theodosius the responsibility for what had gone amiss: for Emperors could do no wrong. And it is of interest, too, that he and his fellows of the West were far more concerned at that moment with Attila than with Eutyches; for the safety of their churches than for a distant Council.⁷

§ 2. But quite other was the concern of the orthodox Sovereigns of the East: they would settle the doctrine of the Incarnate Person, Hun or no Hun; and, at the same time, settle Dioscorus once for all. They therefore determined, before this second packet of letters from Leo arrived, that no signatures, only the whole episcopate, would suffice; and they issued a summons,⁸ 17 May, to a Council to meet at Nicaea, 1 September 451. At once Leo made the best of it, just as he had been obliged to do in the case of Ephesus. The time was short. On 24 June he appointed as his legates⁹ Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum (now Marsala) in Sicily,¹⁰ and Boniface, a priest, with whom he also associated his envoys already in the East.¹¹ He provided each of them with a copy of his *Tome*, and with further instructions¹²; while Boniface, who set off direct from Rome, carried letters of 26 June to the Emperor, to Anatolius, to Julian of Cos, and to the Council.¹³ Leo would have preferred, he writes to the Council, that its assembling should have been deferred; but he is ready to conform to the Imperial commands. His legates he sends to represent him,

¹ Ep. lxxxiii, § 2; for the invasion of the Huns see Hodgkin, ii. 1-181.

² Ep. lxxxiv (*Op.* i. 1048-50; *P. L.* liv. 921 sq.); Jaffé, No. 464.

³ Ep. lxxxv (*Op.* i. 1050-2; *P. L.* liv. 922-4); Jaffé, No. 465.

⁴ Ibid., § 1.

⁵ Ibid., § 2.

⁶ Ibid., § 3.

⁷ Ep. lxxxiii, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1047; *P. L.* liv. 920).

⁸ *Conc. Chalced.* i. 36, 37 (Mansi, vi. 551 sq., 553 sq.); Hefele, iii. 277 (E. Tr.).

⁹ Ep. lxxxix (*Op.* i. 1060-2; *P. L.* liv. 930-1).

¹⁰ As from a 'securior provincia', *ibid.* (*Op.* i. 1061; *P. L.* liv. 930 B).

¹¹ Ibid., and Ep. xc, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1064 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 934).

¹² Ep. lxxxviii (*Op.* i. 1057-60; *P. L.* liv. 927-9).

¹³ Epp. xc-xciii (*Op.* i. 1063-74; *P. L.* liv. 932-42).

and Paschasinus is to preside in his name.¹ There is no need to discuss the Faith ; it has been sufficiently set out in his *Tome* to Flavian.² The only question is of the restoration of bishops ejected from their sees for loyalty to the Catholic Faith : they must be restored without prejudice to the decisions of the first Council of Ephesus and the condemnation of Nestorius.³ Clearly, the Pope expected that opponents of Eutyches would quickly be denounced as Nestorians ; and this may explain his objection to a Synod in the East, and to its being allowed to reopen debates on the Faith.⁴ Nor were his expectations mistaken. As many as five hundred and twenty⁵ bishops arrived, before long, at Nicaea ; all of them from the Eastern Empire, save the Roman legates and two from Africa, who were there not so much as representatives of their provinces as in the character of fugitives from the Vandals.⁶ Dioscorus was there, with seventeen Egyptians only, but strong in the support of numbers from Palestine and Illyricum. Relying upon these, and giving out, in all likelihood, that every opponent of his was simply a Nestorian, he excommunicated Leo during the days of waiting at Nicaea. But the bolt fell flat : only ten of his suffragans supported him.⁷ The papal legates, meanwhile, were with Marcian at the capital. He could not quit the city⁸—for fear of the Huns in Illyricum⁹—to go so far afield as Nicaea. But he could come to Chalcedon.¹⁰ The Council, however, stood in fear of disturbances from monks of the party of Eutyches, if they ventured so near to Constantinople. But their fears were removed by an enactment of 13 July forbidding disturbances¹¹ ; and this was supplemented by a letter from Pulcheria to the Consular of Bithynia expelling all clerks, monks, and laymen from the precincts of the Council, save such as were present by Imperial orders or in attendance upon their bishops.¹²

¹ *Ep.* xciii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1070 ; *P. L.* liv. 957 A, B) ; on this, see Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 391–2. Leo was within his rights, as the first bishop of Christendom, but ‘ the believing Emperors presided for the sake of order ’, *Ep.* xcvi, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1090 ; *P. L.* liv. 951).

² *Ibid.*, § 2.

³ *Ibid.*, § 3.

⁴ Hefele, *Councils*, iii. 282.

⁵ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 2 (Mansi, vi. 148 c) = Leo, *Ep.* xcvi, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1090 ; *P. L.* liv. 951 c).

⁶ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 641.

⁷ *Libellus Theodori*, ap. *Conc. Chalc.* Actio III, No. 3 (Mansi, vi. 1009 B) ; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 428, n. 1.

⁸ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 38 (Mansi, vi. 553 sq.) ; Fleury, xxvii. li.

⁹ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 42 (Mansi, vi. 560 c) ; Gibbon, c. xxxv (iii. 446) ; Hodgkin, ii. 98, 100.

¹⁰ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 41 (Mansi, vi. 557).

¹¹ Justinian, *Codex*, I. xii. 5.

¹² *Conc. Chalc.* i. 39 (Mansi, vi. 556).

Thus protected, the bishops were required,¹ 22 September, to transport themselves to the Council of Chalcedon,² 8 October–1 November 451.

§ 3. The first session,³ 8 October, took place in the Church of St. Euphemia.⁴ In the absence of ‘the believing Emperors’ who, however, ‘presided for the sake of order’⁵ through their representatives, the conduct of the Council rested with Imperial Commissioners. They consisted of nineteen dignitaries of State,⁶ headed by the Patrician Anatolius, who took their seats in front of the chancel screen⁷; while, on either side, down the nave, were ranged the seats of the bishops. To the left of the Commissioners (for it was the place of honour) sat first the Roman legates who took the lead in the business of the Synod; next, Anatolius of Constantinople; third, Maximus of Antioch; then the exarchs, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Stephen of Ephesus; finally, the other bishops belonging to the ‘dioceses’ of Oriens, Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. Opposite to them, on the right of the tribunal, sat Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the proxy of Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica; and these were supported by the bishops of Egypt, Palestine, and Illyricum. Thus seated, the members of the assembly found themselves arranged in accordance with their opinions: the partisans of Dioscorus behind him on the right; the followers not so much of Cyril as of Leo, behind the papal legates on the left. In the midst were enthroned the Gospels⁸—symbols of the Unseen Master, whom both sides were thus summoned to observe.

The session thus opened, the legates demanded that Dioscorus should be excluded from the assembly; for such, they said, were their instructions.⁹ But the Commissioners insisted that, if this were done, it must be after trial¹⁰; and Dioscorus was ordered to seat himself, as defendant, in the midst. He did so; and was immediately confronted by Eusebius of Dorylaeum. As plaintiff, he also stepped out into the middle of the assembly,¹¹ and de-

¹ *Conc. Chalc.* i. 42 (ib. vi. 559 sqq.).

² Mansi, vi. 529 sqq., vii; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 649 sqq. (E. Tr. iii. 285 sqq.); Fleury, xxviii. i–xxxi.

³ Mansi, vi. 563–938; Fleury, xxviii. i–ix.

⁴ For a description of it see Evagrius, *H. E.* ii, § 3 (*Op.* 284 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. ii. 2491 sqq.).

⁵ Leo, *Ep.* xcvi, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1090; *P. L.* liv. 951); Mansi, vi. 148 c.

⁶ Mansi, vi. 563 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. 580 B.

⁸ Ibid. 580 D.

⁹ Ibid. 580 sq.

¹⁰ Ibid. 581 c.

¹¹ Ibid. 581 D.

manded that the minutes of the late Council of Ephesus should be read.¹ It would then be clear that Dioscorus had violated the Faith in order to set up the heresy of Eutyches,² and had done no less violence to justice in condemning Eusebius.³

The reading began with the Imperial letter of summons⁴; when, at the mention therein of the name of Theodoret,⁵ the Commissioners interposed to say that he ought to be present, for the Pope had restored him to the Episcopate, and the Emperor had commanded that he should take part in the Council.⁶ Theodoret was shown in—to be hailed with cheers from the benches on the left, and with denunciations from the right. Dioscorus, too, from the centre, shouted: ‘To receive Theodoret is to censure the memory of Cyril.’⁷ ‘Out with Dioscorus the murderer,’⁸ retorted the left; and then cried, ‘He is worthy,’⁹ as Theodoret took his seat among the bishops, in the character of second accuser alongside of Eusebius. ‘Bishop? He is no bishop!’ retaliated the Egyptians, ‘Out with the enemy of God’.¹⁰ And so it went on, until, at last, both sides were recalled to order by the Commissioners.¹¹

The Secretaries then came to the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus¹²; and the audience heard how Dioscorus had burked the recitation of the *Tome* of St. Leo,¹³ rehabilitated Eutyches,¹⁴ and gone on to the condemnation first of Flavian¹⁵ and then of Eusebius.¹⁶ With cowardly apologies, the prelates sitting to the left of the Commissioners began to excuse themselves for their share in letting all this be done; for most of them had sat in the synod at Ephesus. ‘Of course,’ urged Thalassius, ‘I had not sufficient authority by myself to get the Pope’s letter read.’¹⁷ ‘We subscribed a blank paper for fear of our lives,’¹⁸ pleaded Acacius, bishop of Ariarathia, by way of excusing himself for signing against Flavian. ‘We all erred, and we all ask for pardon,’¹⁹ cried the rest.

Next came the minutes of Flavian’s Council of Constantinople,²⁰ which were embodied in those of Ephesus; and the bishops

¹ Mansi, vi. 585 c.

² Ibid. 585 A.

³ Ibid. 585 B.

⁴ *Cunctis constitit* of 30 March 449; *ibid.* 587–90.

⁵ Ibid. 589 A.

⁶ Ibid. 589 B.

⁷ Ibid. 589 C.

⁸ Ibid. 589 D.

⁹ Ibid. 592 B.

¹⁰ Ibid. 592 B.

¹¹ Ibid. 592 D.

¹² Ibid. 605 sqq.

¹³ Ibid. 616 A.

¹⁴ Ibid. 861 B.

¹⁵ Ibid. 908 c.

¹⁶ Ibid. 908 c.

¹⁷ Ibid. 617 c.

¹⁸ Ibid. 625 B.

¹⁹ Ibid. 637 c, d.

²⁰ Ibid. 649 sqq.

heard how Flavian's declaration of Faith there made¹ was in strict accord with the language *officially* used by Cyril. 'It would be an advantage', observed the Commissioners, 'to hear the opinion of the bishops here present upon that point.'² So, beginning with the legate Paschasinus, who said that Flavian's exposition of the Faith was sound and in unison with the *Tome* of Leo,³ the prelates declared, one after another, their satisfaction with it. 'The martyr Flavian rightly explained the Faith,' was the general verdict.⁴ Thereupon, seeing how the wind had permanently changed, the weathercocks went with it. Juvenal, for instance, rose from his seat, and crossed over to the opposite benches, followed by all the bishops of Palestine.⁵ The bishops of Illyricum flitted across too⁶—all except one, viz. Atticus, bishop of Nicopolis 446–†51, and metropolitan of Epirus Vetus, who pretended to be indisposed and went out as they rose.⁷ Even four Egyptians deserted Dioscorus before his very eyes.⁸

At last the interminable recitation of minutes was over, and no doubt remained that the Synod disapproved of the rehabilitation of Eutyches, of the condemnation of Flavian, and of the tyranny by which these ends had been achieved. It remained to bring its authors to justice; but it was getting dark, and lights were brought in.⁹ The Commissioners therefore announced that the question of doctrine would be deferred, but taken next; they were of opinion, however, that Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia were the persons really responsible for the misdeeds of Ephesus; and, as such, should be deposed forthwith.¹⁰ 'A just sentence,' exclaimed the assembly; and, as it broke up, the bishops raised, for the first occasion on which it is recorded to have been used,¹¹ the celebrated anthem known as the *Trisagion*: 'Holy God, holy and strong, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us'.¹²

¹ Mansi, vi. 677–80.² Ibid. 680 c.³ Ibid. 680 c.⁴ Ibid. 681 A.⁵ Ibid. 681 B.⁶ Ibid. 681 B–684 c.⁷ Ibid. 684 c.⁸ Ibid. 681 E, 684 A.⁹ Ibid. 901 c.¹⁰ Ibid. 936 A–C.¹¹ Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 83.¹² Mansi, vi. 936 c. 'Its normal place' in the liturgy 'is before the lections'; and it occurs 'in all the Greek Oriental liturgies' (Duchesne, *Chr. W.* ⁵ 83); in the Coptic, before the Gospel and after the other lections (ibid., n. 3); in the Gallican also before the Gospel (i. e. at the 'Little Entrance', ibid. 197, and after it; and in the modern Roman rite in the Reproaches of Good Friday, both in Greek and Latin.

§ 4. The second session¹ took place, 10 October, in the absence of Dioscorus and the others deposed.² It was opened by a declaration from the Commissioners to the effect that, Flavian and Eusebius being now rehabilitated, the bishops should address themselves to 'the establishment of the true Faith, as this was the task for which the Council was assembled'³: only we would have you know', they said, 'that the Most Divine and Religious the Lord of the World, and we ourselves follow the Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, and the other Fathers'.⁴ Nothing loth, they found in Leo's treatment of the case of Eutyches a 'model' of doctrinal statement⁵; and proceeded to read once more the standing expositions of the Faith, with the addition of his. Thus, they had recited in turn the Creed of Nicaea,⁶ the Creed of Constantinople,⁷ Cyril's second letter to Nestorius⁸ [*Obloquentur*] and his letter to John⁹ [*Laetentur caeli*]; followed by the *Tome* of St. Leo,¹⁰ together with some extracts¹¹ from the Fathers which the Pope had since collected, viz. from Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Cyril. As to the *Tome*,¹² after a brief preface, § 1, on the obstinacy and the incompetence of Eutyches, Leo observes, § 2, that, if only he had kept close to the Creed of his baptism, he would have found there clearly stated two complementary truths about our Lord: (a) that He is the proper Son of God, and yet (b) that He submitted to a real human birth. These two truths he would have found amply borne out by St. Matthew and St. Paul and the Old Testament prophecies, which all teach a real Incarnation; so that, § 3, Two Natures, without confusion, both meet and remain in One Person, and, § 4, each Nature, being permanent, retains its own sphere of action; for, § 5, the properties of each Nature remain distinct, though they are referable to the one Person of the Son of God. Eutyches has rejected this *communicatio idiomatum*¹³ and has 'dissolved Jesus' by denying His

¹ Mansi, vi. 937-76; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 685-90 (E. Tr. iii. 315-19); Fleury, XXVIII. x, xi.

² Their names do not appear in the list given in Mansi, vi. 939-52, save that the name of Eustathius of Berytus is there (941 E), but by mistake, Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 434, n. 1.

³ Mansi, vi. 952 c.

⁴ Ibid. 953 A.

⁵ Ibid. 953 B.

⁶ Ibid. 956.

⁷ Ibid. 957.

⁸ Ibid. 960 A.

⁹ Ibid. 960 B.

¹⁰ Ibid. 960 D.

¹¹ Ibid. 961-72.

¹² Leo, *Ep.* xxviii (*Op.* i. 801-38; *P. L.* liv. 755-82); Jaffé, No. 423; text, tr., and notes in T. H. Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 195 sqq.; tr. and notes in W. Bright, *Sermons of St. Leo* 2, 109 sqq.

¹³ On which, see note in W. Bright, *St. Leo* 2, 130.

Human Nature and recurring to docetic views of His body and His passion. As for, § 6, his confession of 'Two Natures before the Union', it is, of course, meaningless; but also as impious to assert that 'after the Word was made flesh, but a single Nature remained in Him'. 'Endeavour to reclaim him,' urges Leo, 'and, if possible, restore him: I am sending three legates to the Council' [*sc.* of Ephesus]. The drift of this letter was, in effect, to reaffirm, concisely but emphatically, Cyril's official teaching to the exclusion of his more spontaneous utterances; while Leo's selection of extracts, since added, from Cyril, manifested a similar tendency. They did not preclude the Pope from repudiating elsewhere¹ the Cyrilline phrase, 'One nature incarnate'. They were actually such as showed Cyril explicitly to have asserted 'the distinction of Natures' in Christ.² The *Tome* thus read, it now appeared that whether Commissioners, Pope, or Council referred to 'the Fathers', all were at one in ignoring Cyril's third letter to Nestorius [*Cum Salvator*], i. e. the letter with the Twelve Anathematisms. A minority of the Synod, consisting of Palestinians and Illyrians,³ were quick to notice both the assertions of Leo and the absence of all real reference to the Anathematisms. Others, indeed, acclaimed the *Tome*, crying, 'Peter hath spoken through Leo',⁴ and meaning that Leo had brought out the true import of Peter's confession; but these found a difficulty with three passages⁵ of the *Tome*, in which it seemed to them to approximate to Nestorianism; and Atticus of Nicopolis, who had recovered from his indisposition, so well timed when it was a question of exonerating Flavian, now demanded a few days wherein to compare the letter of Leo with the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius, in which Cyril had requested the consent of his opponent to the Twelve Anathematisms.⁶ The bishops pretended not to hear; but the Commissioners granted a five days' adjournment, during which a committee was to meet under the chairmanship of Anatolius, and prepare a statement such as would reassure doubters, like Atticus, concerning the Truth.⁷

¹ *Ep.* lxxxviii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1058; *P. L.* liv. 927 B).

² Mansi, vi. 969 E, from Cyril's *Scholia de Incarnatione*, § 13 (*Op.* viii. 787 sq.; *P. G.* lxxv. 1385 c).

³ Mansi, vi. 972 sq.

⁴ *Ibid.* 972 A, B.

⁵ viz. (1) 'Et ad resolvendum . . . ex altero,' § 3 (*Op.* i. 813; *P. L.* liv. 763 B); (2) 'Agit enim utraque forma . . . iniuriis,' § 4 (*Op.* i. 819; *P. L.* liv. 767 B); (3) 'Quamvis enim . . . divinitus,' § 4 (*Op.* i. 824; *P. L.* liv. 769).

⁶ Mansi, vi. 973 B, c.

⁷ *Ibid.* 973 D.

§ 5. In the meanwhile, at a third session,¹ 13 October, the Council took up, for ecclesiastical decision, the case of Dioscorus ; for, at the end of the previous session, a few had requested consideration for him, though in vain.² On this occasion, the Commissioners were not present ; they had said their say, so far as Dioscorus was concerned ; his affair then was left for settlement to the Council, with Paschasinus, as legate of Leo, presiding.³ They sent two deputations,⁴ in succession, to summon Dioscorus ; but he refused to attend, on the plea that the Commissioners were absent. Then four Alexandrians put in an appearance—two deacons, Theodore and Ischyrius, much in the confidence of Cyril ; his nephew, Athanasius, a priest ; and Sophronius, a layman. They put in petitions⁵ to ‘Leo, oecumenical archbishop and patriarch of Great Rome and to the oecumenical Council’ : in which the denunciations indiscriminately heaped on Dioscorus were as surprising as the novel title bestowed on the Pope. The Council, however, took little notice of either ; and sent a third summons to Dioscorus.⁶ Still, he declined to come⁷ : so they proceeded against him for contumacy, the legates first summing up his misdeeds and pronouncing sentence. ‘Dioscorus’, they declared, ‘has been guilty of many offences. He ignored the sentence of Flavian against Eutyches. On his own authority he received Eutyches into communion,⁸ before sitting with his colleagues in synod at Ephesus. They have been excused : but he glories in what he did there—not suffering, for example, the letter of Leo to be read. Even this might have been overlooked, if he had not afterwards dared to excommunicate Leo, and to ignore our repeated citations. Leo therefore by us and by the present holy Synod, together with St. Peter, who is the rock of the Church and the basis of right Faith, deprives him of his episcopal dignity.’ A sonorous preface, to a sentence which was not that of the Pope alone : for the legate continues, ‘Now therefore the Synod will vote in accordance with the canons’⁹ ; and this the bishops, in turn, proceeded to do. Anatolius of Constantinople ‘agrees in all points with the Apostolic See’.¹⁰ Maximus of

¹ Mansi, vi. 975–1102 ; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 690–9 (E. Tr. iii. 320–9) ; Fleury, xxviii. xii–xiv.

² Ibid. 975 A–C.

³ Ibid. 985 A.

⁴ Ibid. 989 B, 996 C.

⁵ Ibid. 1005 B, 1012 B, 1021 C, 1029 C, D.

⁶ Ibid. 1036 B.

⁷ Ibid. 1041 C.

⁸ For this offence against Catholic unity, see J. Bingham, *Ant.* xvi. ii, § 10, and Fleury, xxviii. xiv (iii. 357, note g).

⁹ Mansi, vi. 1048 B.

¹⁰ Ibid. 1048 C.

Antioch 'subjects Dioscorus to ecclesiastical sentence, even as Leo and Anatolius have done'.¹ Others 'judge', 'decide',² 'give sentence'.³ The sentence was thus not Leo's simply, but that of the Pope made its own by the Council; and so it is described in reports of the deposition of Dioscorus sent to the offender himself,⁴ to the clergy,⁵ to the laity⁶ of Constantinople and Chalcedon. Similarly, in the Synodical Letters, informing Valentinian and Marcian⁷ and Pulchéria⁸ of what had passed, the bishops declared 'Dioscorus to have been stripped of his episcopate by the Oecumenical Council',⁹ and say that 'we have with sorrow denied him our communion and against our wishes declared him to be alien from episcopal dignity'.¹⁰

§ 6. Dioscorus thus got rid of, the Council at its fourth session,¹¹ 17 October, returned to the question of the Faith. The magistrates presided once more; and, after having the minutes of the first two sessions read over,¹² they requested the Council to express its mind concerning the Faith. In answer, Paschasinus, on behalf of the legates, referred to 'The Rule of Faith as contained in the Creed of Nicaea, confirmed by the Council of Constantinople, expounded at Ephesus under Cyril, and set forth in the letter of Pope Leo when he condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches. The present Synod,' he added, 'holds this Faith; and can neither add thereto, nor take therefrom'.¹³ This statement the bishops received with shouts of assent. 'So we all believe! So we were baptized! So we baptize'¹⁴—words which are a good example of the way in which Councils conceived themselves to be simply the guardians and exponents of tradition. Thereupon the Commissioners bade them one by one declare if they considered the 'expositions' of Nicaea and Constantinople 'to be in accord with the letter of the most reverend archbishop Leo'.¹⁵ The meaning to be put upon the phrase is clear from their replies. 'The letter of Leo', began Anatolius, 'is in harmony with the Creed as well as with what was done at Ephesus under Cyril'.¹⁶ 'It is plain', said the legates themselves, 'that the Faith of Leo is in harmony with the Creed, and with the Ephesian definitions;

¹ Mansi, vi. 1047 sq.² Ibid. 1049 c.³ Ibid. 1048 d.⁴ Ibid. 1093-6.⁵ Ibid. 1096 B, c.⁶ Ibid. 1097 A-C.⁷ Ibid. 1097-1100.⁸ Ibid. 1101 sq.⁹ Ibid. 1099 c.¹⁰ Ibid. 1101 sq.¹¹ Ibid. vii. 1-98; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 700-15 (E. Tr. iii. 329-42);

Fleury, xxviii. xv-xix.

¹² Mansi, vii. 5 A-8 c.¹³ Ibid. 9 A, B.¹⁴ Ibid. 9 B.¹⁵ Ibid. 9 c.¹⁶ Ibid. 9 c, d.

and therefore his letter is of the same sense as the Creed'.¹ It is well to note this language of the papal representatives. So far from attributing to the papal letter any infallibility or final and independent authority of its own,² they declare that the *Tome* is to be accepted as being in accordance with the Creed and the subsequent doctrinal decisions of the episcopate. And the bishops accepted it, one by one, on this ground and no other. 'It agrees,' said Maximus of Antioch, 'and I have signed it'.³ 'As far as I understand, it agrees,'⁴ said a second. And a third assented because 'Leo is shown to have followed the Nicene Faith, as did Cyril'.⁵ True, the bishops had, many of them, signed the *Tome* at an earlier stage; but the point is that they did not merely accept it on the authority of the Pope, as if that were all. They tested, approved, and so raised it to the level of an oecumenical standard of the Faith, precisely as the letter of Cyril to Nestorius had been examined, authenticated, and raised to that rank at Ephesus, *after* it had received the approval of Pope Caelestinus.⁶ On Vaticanist principles,⁷ it was *de fide* from the date of its publication, 13 June 449; but the Council did not treat it so. They examined it and made it *de fide* on 17 October 451. To pass on. They were unanimous in their acceptance of it; for the Illyrian and Palestinian contingents had been satisfied by the committee of Anatolius, and now clearly understood that, in accepting the *Tome*, they would not be opening the door again to Nestorianism.⁸ The Commissioners then called for consent by acclamation. It was given⁹; and the remainder of the session was devoted to the reinstatement of the five associates of Dioscorus in condemnation¹⁰ and to the case of thirteen Egyptians¹¹ who, anticipating the line taken up by the Monophysites later on,¹² were willing to make a sacrifice of Eutyches,¹³ but persisted that to sign the *Tome*¹⁴ or to repudiate Dioscorus¹⁵ would expose them to certain death on returning to their own country.¹⁶ They were relegated, therefore, to temporary safe-keeping at Constantinople,

¹ Mansi, vii. 12 A.² Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 451-63.³ Mansi, vii. 12 B.⁴ Ibid. 12 C.⁵ Ibid. 13 A.⁶ Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 368, 455.⁷ 'Ea infallibilitate pollere qua Divinus Redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae irreformabiles esse.' *Conc. Vat. Sessio iv*, § 4.⁸ Mansi, vii. 29-34.⁹ Ibid. 48 A.¹⁰ Ibid. 48 sq.¹¹ Ibid. 49 sqq.¹² Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 48, n. 1; cf. Mansi, vii. 80 A.¹³ Ibid. 56 A.¹⁴ Ibid. 56 B.¹⁵ Ibid. 60 B.¹⁶ Ibid. 57 B.

till their new Patriarch should be elected.¹ There remained the opposition of the monks of the party of Eutyches still to be dealt with.² Including Barsumas, the 'assassin' of Flavian,³ as he was hailed⁴ in appearing before the Council, they refused assent to anything posterior to the Nicene Creed, save the deposition of Nestorius.⁵ They were allowed time for reflection⁶; and the session closed by the settlement of a dispute⁷ between Photius of Tyre, metropolitan of Phoenicia I, and his suffragan Eustathius of Beyrout. Eustathius had availed himself of the favour in which he stood with the Emperor Theodosius II to get Beyrout erected into a titular metropolis.⁸ He then turned upon Photius and claimed against him the rights of a metropolitan⁹—much as Anthimus of Tyana claimed similar recognition from St. Basil, when Valens erected Cappadocia II into a province with Tyana for its metropolis. Anthimus carried his point, on the principle disowned in the West, but generally accepted in the East, that ecclesiastical divisions should conform to civil.¹⁰ But there was a flaw at some point in the case of Eustathius,¹¹ and he failed of the success of Anthimus. The petition of Photius being read,¹² the Commissioners, on behalf of the Emperor, announced that he wished the affairs of bishops to be regulated not by 'the formal decision given by the Emperor in Consistory'¹³ and known as the Pragmatic Sanction'¹⁴ but by Canon. 'Is that the wish of the Synod?' asked the Commissioners. 'Yes: by Canon.'¹⁵ Eustathius adroitly pleaded in his favour a decision by the Home Synod at Constantinople.¹⁶ But that informal assemblage was ignored, and his case decided by reference to the fourth canon of Nicaea.¹⁷ Photius, accordingly, was to have the whole power of consecrating bishops in all the cities of Phoenicia I; and Eustathius, who had endeavoured to annex six of them for his metropolitanate, was

¹ Mansi, vii. 60 c, d; *Conc. Chalc.*, c. 30 (W. Bright, *Canons*², xlviii. 236 sqq.). ² Mansi, vii. 61 sqq. ³ Ibid. 68 B. ⁴ Ibid. 68 c.

⁵ Ibid. 73 A, 76 B. ⁶ Ibid. 84. ⁷ Ibid. 85 sqq.; Fleury, xxviii. xix.

⁸ Ibid. 38 B.

⁹ Ibid. 89 c.

¹⁰ Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xliii, § 58 (*Op.* ii. 814; *P. G.* xxxvi. 572 A).

¹¹ Theodosius had 'only conferred the *title* of metropolis on the city, and had not professed to divide the province for civil, much less for ecclesiastical purposes', W. Bright, *Canons*², 188.

¹² Mansi, vii. 85 sqq.

¹³ Fleury, xxviii. xix (iii. 368, note p).

¹⁴ Mansi, vii. 89 A; on the later history of the phrase, see W. Bright, *Canons*², 187 sq. It is 'pragmatic' as dealing with some public 'affair' (πραγμα).

¹⁵ Mansi, vii. 89 B.

¹⁶ Ibid. 89 D; Anatolius explains what it is, *ibid.* 92 c.

¹⁷ Ibid. 93 A.

not, in virtue of the Pragmatic Sanction, to have more than any other bishop of the province.¹

§ 7. At the fifth session,² 22 October, the Council reached the crisis of its deliberations. Hitherto they had simply discussed the fate of persons. Now they turned to the definition of the Faith: the objective so ardently desired by the Government. A committee, appointed at the second session and presided over by Anatolius, had already made an attempt in this direction by drafting a doctrinal formulary. At the request of the magistrates it was read; but, as it was not entered on the minutes,³ it is no longer extant. The greater number professed themselves satisfied with this definition; but a minority, consisting of 'Orientals' supported by the Roman legates,⁴ were of opinion that, as it was not in sufficiently close accord with the *Tome* of St. Leo, it would fail to secure the end desired, viz. the exclusion of Eutychianism. It did not, in fact, contain the phrase 'in two natures', to which the Pope attached so great importance.⁵ Fearing, then, that this document would be accepted as it stood, the legates demanded their passports and threatened to leave. 'We will go home,' they announced, 'and a synod shall meet in the West.'⁶ But this would have been to blight all hopes of union; and the Commissioners resorted to the expedient, familiar to modern governments when their legislatures get out of hand, of relieving the tension by proposing the appointment of a committee to report on the situation.⁷ The Council, however, would not listen to the proposal. They insisted on the *Definition*, pure and simple. 'We all approve it! Let it be signed! He who signs not is a heretic! Mary is *Theotokos*! Out with the Nestorians! Christ is God!'⁸ By 'Nestorians' they meant the minority led by Rome and recruited from 'the East', whose language and sympathies they suspected of opening the door again to Nestorianism. But this was a misapprehension; and the Commissioners pointed out to the assembly that the *Definition*, as it stood, was deficient: it could be readily accepted by Dioscorus. 'Dioscorus stated,' they said, 'that he deposed Flavian for saying "there are two natures";

¹ Mansi, vii. 93 D.

² Ibid. 97-118; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 716-31 (E. Tr. iii. 342-53); Fleury, xxviii. xx, xxi.

³ Mansi, vii. 100 C.

⁴ Ibid. 101 A.

⁵ e. g. *Ep.* xxviii, §§ 3, 5 (*Op.* i. 813, 824; *P. L.* liv. 763 B, 771 A).

⁶ Mansi, vii. 101 C.

⁷ Ibid. 101 C.

⁸ Ibid. 104 A.

and the *Definition* only says Christ is “of two natures”.¹ This was to touch Anatolius on the quick. He had a fatherly pride in the document which his committee had framed. He rose to observe that Dioscorus had been condemned not for his doctrine, but for having excommunicated Leo, and for refusing to obey the Council. Ignoring Anatolius, the Commissioners resumed: ‘You received and signed the archbishop Leo’s letter?’ ‘Yes,’ the bishops answered, ‘we received and subscribed it.’ ‘Well then,’ urged the Commissioners, ‘the Council is bound to adopt in its *Definition* the phrase which is characteristic of that letter.’ They referred, of course, to ‘in both natures’²; but did not say so. The majority had to be humoured. All they would say was: ‘We are for the *Definition*, neither more nor less. It is in no way deficient. Leo believes as do we.’³ There was nothing for it but to fall back on the authority of the Emperor; and the Commissioners, at this point, sent across to Constantinople for instructions. In reply, they received an order that either (a) the committee proposed must be set to work, or (b) the bishops, one by one, must express their belief through their metropolitans, or (c) a synod would have to be held in the West, in view of the refusal of the Council to give adequate expression to the Faith.⁴ The order is an excellent specimen of Byzantinism; but, on this occasion, the Court knew that it had the good-will of Leo. Pope and Emperor, however, were alike resisted. ‘We’ll have the *Definition*’, shouted some of the majority, ‘or off we’ll go.’⁵ And the Illyrians, for all their subjection to the papal Vicar at Thessalonica, added, ‘Those who object can be off to Rome.’⁶ With exemplary patience, the Commissioners explained again. ‘Dioscorus,’ they repeated, ‘admits that Christ is of two natures: what he does not admit is that “there are two natures” in Christ,⁷ i.e. that now they both exist side by side in Him. But this is just what Leo asserts. Now then: which are your lordships for? For Leo? or for Dioscorus?’ The real choice, though the Commissioners did not say so, lay between Leo and Cyril; for by Cyril’s spontaneous, as distinct from his official, language⁸ Dioscorus and the Monophysites could

¹ Mansi, vii. 104 B.

² ‘In utraque natura,’ Leo, *Ep.* xxviii, § 5 (*Op.* i. 824; *P. L.* liv. 771 A).

³ Mansi, vii. 104 C.

⁴ Ibid. 104 sq.

⁵ Ibid. 105 B.

⁶ Ibid. 105 C.

⁷ Διόσκορος ἔλεγε· τὸ ἐκ δύο φύσεων δέχομαι· τὸ δὲ δύο οὐ δέχομαι, *ibid.* 105 C.

⁸ There were two Cyrils: the Cyril of the XII Articles (spontaneous), and the (official) Cyril of *Obloquuntur* and *Laetentur caeli*.

have colourably justified themselves. But, put as the Commissioners put it, the argument told. 'We believe with Leo,' cried the assembly. 'Very well, then: insert in your *Definition* that "there *are* two natures in Christ", i.e. that He exists not only "of two natures" but "*in* two natures".'¹

Where the Roman legates had failed, the Imperial Commissioners succeeded. They spoke Greek. They were probably less imperious in tone. They were laymen, and urged not theology, but consistency. They spoke with the weight of the Imperial authority behind their words. At any rate, the committee retired once more²; and, emerging again from the side-chapel where they had amended their draft, they produced the *Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith*.³ It was immediately read to the Council, and, in its capital clause, runs: 'Following therefore the holy Fathers, we all teach, with one accord, one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ . . . who for us men and for our salvation, according to the manhood, was born of the Virgin Mary, the God-bearer,⁴ one and the same Christ, Son, Lord—only-begotten, confessed in two natures,⁵ without confusion,⁶ without change, without division⁷ or separation. The difference of the natures is in no way denied by reason of their union; on the other hand, the peculiarity of each nature is preserved, and both concur in one Person and one Hypostasis.' The *Definition* carries on the language of Cyril in his official utterances; but that language is balanced by still greater obligations to the *Reunion Creed of the Antiochenes*, to the *Tome* of St. Proclus, and to the *Tome* of St. Leo. It was thus the end of a period of theological definition; for it struck no compromise, but boldly comprehended in one exposition what either side severally held dear. Greeted with acclamation⁸ as soon as it was read in the Council, it won its place forthwith among the Christian standards of doctrine, but only after a hard-fought struggle.

§ 8. Nothing remained but to sign it, and to provide, at the sixth session,⁹ 25 October, for its formal promulgation. Marcian and Pulcheria crossed the water and presented themselves in state at the Council.¹⁰ The Emperor addressed the bishops, first in

¹ Mansi, vii. 105 D.

² Ibid. 105 D.

³ Ibid. 108-18; T. H. Bindley, *Oec. Doc.* 229 sqq., and Document No. 214.

⁴ Θεοτόκου.

⁵ Ἐν δύο φύσεσιν.

⁶ ἀσυγχύτως.

⁷ ἀδιαίρετως.

⁸ Mansi, vii. 117 A.

⁹ Ibid. 117-78; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 732-5 (E. Tr. iii. 353-5); Fleury, xxviii. xxii.

¹⁰ Mansi, vii. 127 sq.

Latin¹ (for Latin was still the official language of the Empire), and then in Greek.² Next, the *Definition* was read,³ with the signatures—amounting in all, proxies included, to over six hundred.⁴ It was immediately accorded civil sanction by Marcian's pronouncement, *Si quis igitur*.⁵ Contemporaries considered this moment the climax of the Council. But, in truth, the Council had capitulated to an alliance, already agreed upon, between Pope and Emperor. For these two potentates directed the minority, and produced a situation at the Council very like that which the far-sighted handful, inspired by the deacon Athanasius, had procured at Nicaea. As at Nicaea the majority made no scruple of sacrificing Arius, so now at Chalcedon they found no difficulty in dropping Eutyches. As at Nicaea the majority did not wish for a definition, so now they only provided an effective one under pressure. As at Nicaea the synod of Chalcedon would have preferred a comprehensive formulary; whether because it wished to leave room in the Church for the side actually condemned, or because it did not precisely appreciate the issue at stake. 'One Person, resulting from two Natures' is all that the bishops really wished to say. 'One Person in two Natures' is what they were induced to say. And again, as with the *Homoousion* at Nicaea, it was a formula in its origin Western—in this case, papal—that the Council had to adopt. For the moment and in the end it was an advantage that the Roman legates and the Imperial Commissioners should have insisted on precise terminology—viz. 'In two natures'—just as it was an immediate and an ultimate gain that the minority at Nicaea should have carried their decisive 'Of one substance with the Father'. But, in each case, precise definition was secured by the coercion of a majority leaning towards inclusion; and the price was reaction and long years of disunion. The Arianizing parties after Nicaea kept the Church in dissension till unity was reimposed by the sword of the last Sovereign of the united Empire, Theodosius the Great. Now, the control even of the Eastern Empire was slipping away from the Byzantine Court—specially in the outlying regions—Armenia, Syria, and Egypt—where its Greek culture had never succeeded in ousting the native tongues and traditions. Few, then, in these provinces, would welcome the *Definition* of Chalcedon: only those

¹ Mansi, vii. 129 sq.² Ibid. 132 sq.³ Ibid. 136 B.⁴ Ibid. 136 sqq.⁵ Ibid. 174 B.

afterwards known as *Melkites*, or adherents of the Court, which was really its author ; and the Nestorians, who hailed its affirmation of dyophysitism as a vindication of Nestorius. Otherwise, Armenian, Syriac, and Copt became Monophysite : partly because they were conscious that the majority at Chalcedon was, like themselves, in sympathy with Cyril rather than with Leo, but also because they were determined upon nationalism and native culture to the exclusion of Greek and Imperial domination. The unity of the Church was broken by the Council, and could not be recovered, for the unity of the Empire, which had restored it once before, was itself breaking up.

From the sixth to the sixteenth sessions,¹ 25 October–1 November, business was taken of less moment than the *Definition of the Faith* ; but, nevertheless, of lasting importance, save for the readjustment of two or three personal matters.

§ 9. On 25 October the *Definition* had just been read and the Sovereigns saluted, Marcian as the new Constantine² and Pulcheria as the new Helena,³ when the Emperor rose and gave legal protection to the Catholic Faith by *Si quis igitur*,⁴ afterwards embodied in the edict *Nemo clericus*⁵ of 7 February 452, of which more presently. He next proposed three drafts⁶ of canons for approbation by the Council. The first had in view the increase of lawlessness on the part of monks in the Eastern Empire, such as they never ventured in the West, where they were fewer and under control. Monks, it will be remembered, had interfered with the commissioners of Theodosius at Antioch, 24 March 387. Next year, they provoked that Emperor to remark to Ambrose, apropos of an exploit of theirs in Osrhöene, that monks commit many crimes. They drew from his son, Arcadius, the enactment *Addictos supplicio*⁷ of 27 July 398, in which he forbade their habit of forcibly rescuing criminals from justice. They exhibited their fanaticism by demonstrating against Chrysostom in exile,⁸ by seconding, or by returning with interest, the violence of Theophilus,⁹ and by mobbing Orestes¹⁰ on behalf of Cyril. Cyril, in fact, and those who, like Eutyches and Dioscorus, would claim to carry on the Cyrilline tradition, had profited by their use of force.

¹ Fleury, xxviii. xxii–xxx.

² Mansi, vii. 169 c.

³ Ibid. 172 A.

⁴ Ibid. 173 B.

⁵ Ibid. 475–8 ; Fleury, xxviii. xxxiv.

⁶ Ibid. 173–6.

⁷ *Cod. Theod.* ix. xl. 16.

⁸ *Ep.* xiv, § 3 (*Op.* iii. 597 ; *P. G.* li. 615).

⁹ *Socr. H. E.* vi. vii.

¹⁰ Ibid. vii. xiv.

Barsumas, for instance, had actually led the murderous attack on Flavian at the *Latrocinium* which resulted in his death. It was time to check their fanaticism; and Marcian now proposed that monks should be subject to their bishops and should not meddle unauthorized, in public affairs. A second proposal aimed at the growing secularity of tone among clergy and Religious: it prohibited them from farming property or business, for gain, and as stewards for others. A third forbade a cleric to desert the church in which he was ordained and migrate to another: it probably was directed against clerical rapacity. 'I think it right', said the Emperor in support of these three proposals, 'that they should be enacted by canon in your Synod, and not by any law of mine.'¹ They accordingly became the fourth, third, and fifth canons of Chalcedon.² Marcian then bestowed upon Chalcedon the titular status of a metropolis, saving all rights to the bishop of Nicomedia as metropolitan,³ and departed. The rest of the legislation of the Council is attributed by Evagrius⁴ to a session following immediately upon the Imperial visit, though he distinguishes it from the seventh.

§ 10. The seventh session⁵ was held 26 October, and may best be taken in company with the sixteenth⁶ and last, 1 November; for on these dates respectively were consolidated the new Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople. Some questions touching persons were taken in the interval; at the eighth session, of 26 October, the rehabilitation of Theodoret⁷; at the ninth and tenth, of 27-8 October, the restoration of Ibas⁸ and the matter of a pension for Domnus⁹; an unedifying dispute, at the eleventh

¹ Mansi, vii. 173 c.

² W. Bright, *Canons* 2, xxxix-xli. 149-66.

³ Mansi, vii. 177 A, B.

⁴ *H. E.* ii, § 18 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2588 A); Fleury, xxviii. xxii. For this legislation, see W. Bright, *Canons* 2, xxxix sqq., 140 sqq; it is printed with the fifteenth session in Mansi, vii. 393-422; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 767-828 (*E. Tr.* iii. 383-422); Fleury, xxviii. xxix.

⁵ Mansi, vii. 177-84; Fleury, xxviii. xxiii; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 735-40 (*E. Tr.* iii. 355 sq.).

⁶ Mansi, 423-54 (=Fleury, xxviii. xxx; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 829-34 (*E. Tr.* iii. 422-8)).

⁷ Mansi, vii. 185-94; Fleury, xxviii. xxiv; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 740-1 (*E. Tr.* iii. 356-7). He had been deposed at the *Latrocinium*, and recalled from exile by the Emperor. His restoration was the act not of the Pope but of the Synod, Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 397-401.

⁸ Mansi, vii. 193-270; Fleury, xxviii. xxv; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 742-53 (*E. Tr.* iii. 358-70).

⁹ Mansi, vii. 269-72; Fleury, xxviii. xxv; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 753-5 (*E. Tr.* iii. 370).

and twelfth, of 29–30 October, between Bassian, ex-bishop, and Stephen, bishop, 449–51, of Ephesus¹; a case for decision between the bishop of Nicaea and his metropolitan at the thirteenth session² of 30 October; and at the fourteenth, on 31 October, the rival claims of Sabinian and Athanasius upon the see of Perrha in Syria.³

We pass on to what, next to the *Definition of the Faith*, has been the most abiding result of the Council of Chalcedon: its creation, or recognition, of two Eastern Patriarchates, both at the expense of Antioch, and one of them a rival—long ago defeated, but still hated—to Rome itself.

§ 11. First, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The Council of Nicaea, in recognizing the ancient rights of the chief sees, had assigned an honorary precedence to the bishop of Jerusalem, without withdrawing him from the authority of his metropolitan, the bishop of Caesarea.⁴ Precedence even over his metropolitan, however, the bishop of Jerusalem enjoyed in councils held outside Palestine, both before and after Nicaea. Thus, at the Council of Antioch, c. 270, which condemned Paul of Samosata, Hymenaeus of Jerusalem, 266–†98, ranks second on the list, and Theotecnus of Caesarea, c. 260–†303?, fourth⁵; just as Juvenal headed the Palestinian contingent on its arrival, 12 June 431, at Ephesus; ranked among the greater prelates there at the *Latrocinium*; and sat next to the Patriarch of Alexandria at Chalcedon. Such honorific status, among the greater prelates, he seems to have long enjoyed; for Eusebius thinks it as desirable to give the episcopal successions at Jerusalem⁶ as at Rome, Alexandria, or Antioch. No doubt this was out of veneration for Jerusalem as the mother-city of Christendom; and such veneration was redoubled after the discovery of the Holy Places and the reverence paid to Jerusalem as a place of pilgrimage. Its bishop acquired an added dignity, and his sense of it brought him into collision with his ecclesiastical superiors. Thus, Cyril, who was bishop of Jerusalem, 348–†86, when Etheria visited the Holy City, c. 370–80, fell foul of his

¹ Mansi, vii. 271–300; Fleury, xxviii. xxvi; Hefele, *Conc.* ii. ii. 755–60 (E. Tr. iii. 370–6).

² Mansi, vii. 301–14; Fleury, xxviii. xxvii; Hefele, *Conc.* ii. ii. 761–3 (E. Tr. iii. 376–9).

³ Mansi, vii. 313–58; Fleury, xxviii. xxviii; Hefele, *Conc.* ii. ii. 763–7 (E. Tr. iii. 379–83).

⁴ Nic. 7; W. Bright, *Canons* 2, xi. 27 sqq.

⁵ Eu. *H. E.* vii. xxx, § 2.

⁶ Ibid. iv. v, § 3, v. xii.

metropolitan, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, 340–†65. No doubt there were theological differences between Cyril the conservative and Acacius the Homoean; but Acacius deposed Cyril¹ over a question of precedence.² His successors were strong enough to maintain their authority thus vindicated. The diocesan synod of Jerusalem 415, for instance, was reviewed by the provincial synod of Diospolis, 415; where Juvenal's predecessor, John, bishop of Jerusalem, 386–†417, sat as a mere member of the assembly over which Eulogius of Caesarea, 404–†17, presided as metropolitan of Palestina I. Juvenal, when he succeeded Praylius, 417–†18, as bishop of Jerusalem, 418–†58, made up his mind to turn precedence into jurisdiction, and to be content with nothing short of power in proportion to the reputation of his see. He began by consecrating bishops for the neighbouring provinces of 'Phoenicia' and 'Arabia'.³ Then, at the first Council of Ephesus, he took advantage of the absence of his metropolitan to present documents in support of his claim which stretched it so far as to assert that the bishop of Antioch, with whom the Council was then at variance, ought to be subject 'to the Apostolic See of Jerusalem'.⁴ Cyril of Alexandria said nothing for the moment. He wanted the support of Juvenal against John. But after their Reunion, 433, he wrote to Leo—whether as archdeacon of Rome or as Pope is uncertain; but, in any case—as to the most influential person there, to urge that no countenance should be given to the pretensions of Juvenal. Proclus, indeed, was disposed to admit them; for Constantinople, as another rival to Antioch, was not above the temptation of willingness to see its powers reduced; but Cyril held his ground.⁵ On the death of Cyril, Juvenal's ambitions revived; and, as the bishop of Jerusalem could only get rid of his subjection to Caesarea by establishing an equality with Antioch, edicts, solicited by Antioch or Jerusalem, mark the last stages of his campaign. Marcian, at length, referred the decision to the Council of Chalcedon⁶; and, after long negotiations, Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem settled the matter by agreement.⁷ The Patriarchate of Antioch kept Phoenicia I and II and Arabia, provinces of which the metropolitical sees were respec-

¹ Socr. *H. E.* II. xl.² Thdt. *H. E.* II. xxvi, § 6.³ Mansi, iv. 1402 D: see also Leo, *Ep.* cxix, § 4 (*Op.* i. 125 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 1044 sq.); Jaffé, No. 495.⁴ Mansi, iv. 1312 D, E.⁵ *Ep.* lvi (*Op.* x. 191 sq.; *P. G.* lxxvii. 320).⁶ Mansi, vii. 180 B.⁷ Ibid. 180 C, D.

tively Tyre, Damascus, and Bostra. Juvenal was henceforth to support the dignity of a Patriarch with the three Palestines, whose metropolitans had their sees respectively at Jerusalem, Scythopolis and Petra. Afterwards, at the Fifth General Council, 553, 'Arabia' was transferred from Antioch to Jerusalem¹; and the newest and fifth Patriarchate of the Church then came to include all the territory from Lebanon to Sinai.

§ 12. Next, as to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.² It was just seventy years since the Second Oecumenical Council, by its third canon,³ had given to that See the second rank in Christendom, on the ground that Constantinople was New Rome. But this precedence carried no jurisdiction; and, by the second canon of the same Council, the bishops of the 'dioceses' of 'Asia' and Pontus were to manage their own affairs, as hitherto.⁴ Nothing, however, was said as to who were their ecclesiastical chiefs, nor were any directions given as to how they were to proceed. In 'Asia' authority had gravitated traditionally round Ephesus; but in Pontus—a 'diocese which stretched from the Bosphorus to Taurus and the Euphrates—there was no such natural centre.' Ancyra, at the centre, was not the civil capital. Caesarea in Cappadocia, where the Vicar of Pontus resided, was too far away; and the sees of Bithynia, though that province was administratively part of the 'diocese', had much more business with the capital than with the former metropolis of St. Basil. Chalcedon, for instance, a Bithynian city where the Council was sitting, had been chosen for that honour because it was, in fact, a suburb within reach of Constantinople. What more natural, therefore, than that the bishoprics of Asia and Pontus, in view either of proximity to the capital or of the want of a convenient local centre, should be drawn into the orbit of Constantinople? Equally natural that the Imperial City, with only twenty or thirty sees in its own 'diocese' of Thrace, should seek for expansion across the water. So we find Chrysostom intervening in Asia, and his successors taking advice of a 'Home Synod' at Constantinople which could regularly be maintained out of the numbers of bishops who happened, from time to time, to be there on business.

On the motion of Anatolius the Council simply gave legal

¹ W. Bright, *Canons* ², 29.

² Mansi, vii. 423 sqq.; Hefele, *Conc.* II. ii. 829 sqq. (E. Tr. iii. 422 sqq.); Fleury, xxviii. xxx.

³ W. Bright, *Canons* ², xxii.

⁴ Ibid. xxi sq.

recognition to this state of affairs ; but in a session, 31 October, from which the Commissioners were absent and with which the Roman legates refused to concern themselves on the plea that their instructions contained no reference to the matter in hand.¹ By the ninth canon it had already been decreed that suits, to which metropolitans were party, might be referred either to the ' exarch ' of the ' diocese ' or to the see of Constantinople² ; and an appellate jurisdiction had thus been conferred on its archbishop. By the twenty-eighth canon,³ now subscribed by Anatolius and a hundred and eighty-three bishops,⁴ not only was his honorary precedence, bestowed in 381, confirmed, but a Patriarchate was created for him by transferring to the archbishop of Constantinople the right to consecrate metropolitans for Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, hitherto enjoyed by the chiefs of the local hierarchy. ' The independent authority of three exarchs, in fact, was annulled to make the archbishop of Constantinople a Patriarch.'⁵

In practice, the canon made no innovation ; it kept the Nicene rule about ' ancient customs ' in spirit,⁶ though it broke it in the letter. But it was met with determined opposition by the Roman legates. At the sixteenth session, 1 November, they called attention to what had been done in the absence of the Commissioners and of themselves, and produced their instructions from Pope Leo. He had enjoined them ' to guard the ordinances of the Fathers and the dignity of his own person ' against possible ' usurpations on the part of those who might rely on the splendour of their sees '⁷ ; and as the Synod had ignored ' the decisions of the three hundred and eighteen at Nicaea ' in favour of ' the hundred and fifty of Constantinople ',⁸ the legates sought permission of the Commissioners to refer to the Nicene authority. Permission was given, and Paschasinus read out the version of the sixth canon of Nicaea, then current in Italy and Sicily, beginning : ' The Roman church hath always had the primacy ; therefore let Egypt also have it (sc. within the Egyptian limits), so that the bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all, since this is also customary for the Roman bishop : and similarly, let him who

¹ Mansi, vii. 425 c-428 A. Their absence was deliberate, Denny, *Papalism*, § 420.

² W. Bright, *Canons* ², xli sq., and Document No. 215.

³ Ibid. xlvii, and Document No. 215.

⁴ Mansi, vii. 429-42.

⁵ W. Bright, *Canons* ², 222.

⁶ Fleury, xxviii. xxxiii (iii. 406, note i) ; Denny, *Papalism*, § 414.

⁷ Mansi, vii. 444 A.

⁸ Ibid. 441 D, E.

is appointed bishop in Antioch; and in the other provinces, let the churches of the larger cities have the first place.’¹ ‘Primacy’ here is clearly used of patriarchal jurisdiction; for what Rome had in her region, Alexandria was to have in hers. There could be no question of papalism²; but, for all that, the version of Paschasinus was immediately put out of court. The Secretary of the Council confronted it with the original Greek of the Nicene Canon³; where, of course, no mention of any Roman ‘primacy’ occurs; and he next read out the first three canons of ‘the hundred and fifty at Constantinople’,⁴ which formed the basis of the legislation now in hand. Another attempt was made by the Roman legates to upset it: they raised doubts as to whether the signatures in its favour had been obtained freely.⁵ This objection the Commissioners parried by calling upon the bishops of Asia and Pontus to state in turn whether they had voted for the twenty-eighth canon by constraint or willingly.⁶ Thirteen metropolitans replied that they ‘signed freely’ or to similar effect⁷; though Eusebius of Ancyra let it appear that he was not enthusiastic about the new proposals. Not that he entertained any jealousy of the rise of Constantinople; but he had his misgivings. He thought that the clergy of the capital might use the right of their archbishop to consecrate metropolitans as machinery for making money.⁸ ‘The reputation’, he said, ‘of my friend Anatolius is, I am well aware, beyond reproach: but no man is immortal.’⁹ Of the other sees most concerned, Ephesus, at the moment, was vacant; and Thalassius, of Caesarea, acquiesced.¹⁰ So the Council—to some of whom the arrangement would be a convenience, while others would find in the elevation of Constantinople a source of legitimate pride—consented.¹¹ The Commissioners then gave their decision,¹² in form of the twenty-eighth canon. In vain the legates entered a final protest; and said that they could not sit by and see ‘the Apostolic See humiliated in our presence’.¹³ ‘Our sentence’, replied the Commissioners, ‘has been approved by the whole Synod.’¹⁴

So ended the Council of Chalcedon; but it was desired to secure

¹ Mansi, vii. 443 B; on this, and other versions, see above, vol. II. c.

² Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 315 sqq.

³ Mansi, vii. 444 D.

⁴ Ibid. 445.

⁵ Ibid. 441 D.

⁶ Ibid. 445 D.

⁷ Ibid. 447–50.

⁸ Ibid. 452 A.

⁹ Ibid. 452 B.

¹⁰ Ibid. 453 A.

¹¹ Ibid. 453 A.

¹² Ibid. 452 sq.

¹³ Ibid. 454 B.

¹⁴ Ibid. 453 c.

the Papal assent and the Imperial confirmation. Before they separated, the bishops sent an address to Marcian¹ in which, after thanks to him and to Leo, they remark that, as in former Councils, all that was done has been to meet new errors with new definitions, and so to preserve the unchanging Faith.² Theology changes, but religion does not.

§ 13. To secure the Papal assent, they dispatched a Synodical Letter³ to Leo. Here, after the manner of Jacob in dealing with Esau, they first appease him, not with presents but with honorific titles, and then delicately approach the point. They acknowledge him, § 1, as 'the interpreter of Peter', as 'the head' of their Synod; as having entertained them, by his *Tome*, at nothing less than a spiritual banquet; and, § 2, as 'the divinely-appointed guardian of the Vine' for excommunicating whom Dioscorus had been deposed. They then proceed to inform him, § 4, that they have lent their authority to a custom of long-standing, and have ordained that the church of Constantinople should consecrate metropolitans for the 'dioceses' of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, not so much with a view to the advantage of Constantinople as for the peace of metropolitical cities in those regions, so often disturbed at the elections of their bishops. They have also confirmed the canon which gave rank to the bishop of Constantinople next after Leo's own see; and are confident of the Pope's goodwill in this matter. His legates, it is true, 'opposed our project; but, doubtless, from a desire that your Holiness might have the honour of making the suggestion yourself!' At any rate, it was the wish of the Emperor, the Senate, and the entire City. It would have been ungracious to do other than acquiesce.

A letter in this tone was too clever by half for a plain man like Leo; and, as if anticipating the bad impression that it would make, both Marcian and Anatolius thought well to supplement it. Their cue was to presume that the legates of Leo did not really know his mind, and so to try to detach him from their proceedings. 'They did their level best', wrote the Emperor, 18 December 451, 'to prevent the Synod from enacting anything concerning this venerable church'⁴; while Anatolius added that Leo's legates,

¹ *Conc. Chalc.* iii, No. 1 (Mansi, vii. 455-74); Fleury, xxviii. xxxi.

² Mansi, vii. 457 A, B.

³ *Conc. Chalc.* iii, No. 2 (Mansi, vii. 473); Leo, *Ep.* xcvi (Op. i. 1088-1100; P. L. liv. 951-60); Fleury, xxviii. xxxi.

⁴ Leo, *Ep.* c, § 3 (Op. i, 1114; P. L. liv. 972 A)

'not knowing his real mind, disturbed the Synod and grossly insulted both me and the church of Constantinople'.¹ But the Pope knew well that his representatives had both understood his wishes and had loyally carried them out. He was not to be propitiated. He determined to get rid of the obnoxious legislation: and had reasons against it—one powerful, but unworthy of him; the others, sound. Thus, in the elevation of Constantinople to the second Patriarchate, he feared a rival to his own; and this was a weighty, though hardly a worthy, reason for opposition. Next, he foresaw that this second Patriarch in Christendom would run the risk of becoming a Pope dependent upon the Court, and he feared the subjection of the Church to the State. True, the State was, for the moment, Pulcheria; but, after that Orthodox Empress, there might well ensue an epoch of Byzantinism unalloyed. Further, the Pope may have had fears for the unity of Christendom. It was now fairly safe under the ancient régime of the whole episcopate with the Pope for its president; but, with the Greek episcopate looking to a chief of its own at Constantinople, and that chief enjoying his pre-eminence and his jurisdiction not as bishop of an Apostolic See but simply as bishop of the Imperial City, there was only too clear a prospect of schism ahead. Once again, if the civil pre-eminence of a city was to entitle its bishop forthwith to supreme ecclesiastical authority, then Rome itself and Leo would have to give place to the archbishop of Ravenna,² the capital of Valentinian III. Solid reasons all, for resistance on Leo's part; but just the very reasons he could not publicly avow. His legates, indeed, had intimated that he might ground his refusal of assent either upon the injury done to his own see or upon the Nicene canons. He was wise enough to decline the former suggestion; but to stake all, as he did, upon the permanence of the Nicene arrangements and the inviolability of Nicene canons as such, was to adopt a position which, whatever it might promise in dealing with Easterns, soon proved to be quite untenable.

Such, however, was the line that he chose when, in letters of 22 May 452, he replied to the Eastern Sovereigns and to Anatolius.³

¹ Leo, *Ep. ci*, § 5 (*Op. i.* 1132-4; *P. L.* liv. 981-3).

² Cf. Gelasius, *Ep. xiii* (*P. L.* lix. 71 c); Jaffé, No. 664 of 1 Feb. 495. This was the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Eastern contention that civil rank alone gave ecclesiastical pre-eminence: see Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 415-17.

³ *Epp. civ-cvi* (*Op. i.* 1144-60; *P. L.* liv. 991-1010); Jaffé, Nos. 481-3.

With so much to say about 'the ambition' and 'the intemperate cupidity' of the Patriarch of Constantinople that we are forcibly reminded of the proverb about those who live in glass houses, Leo goes back to the irregularities in the ecclesiastical career of Anatolius. He had been consecrated by Dioscorus upon the unjust deposition of Flavian; and, while Domnus was still in legal possession of Antioch, he had consecrated Maximus to that dignity. Anatolius, therefore, as Leo reminds the Emperor, 'ought to reflect that I have treated him with lenity rather than justice in admitting his irregular ordination,¹ and in winking at his uncanonical promotion of Maximus'²; and this advice the Pope repeated to Anatolius himself. 'A little of his predecessor Flavian's modesty', Leo tells Pulcheria, 'is what he most needs³: so let him not presume on a concession wrung from his brethren. It can avail nothing against the canons, specially those of Nicaea; for the decrees of that Council, he bids Anatolius remember, are both inviolable⁴ and eternal.'⁵ So much for the personal element behind the legislation. The Pope then turns to the political and ecclesiastical. 'Of course', he observes to Marcian, 'Constantinople has its privileges: but they are purely secular. It is an Imperial City. It cannot become an Apostolic See: and "he loses his own who covets more than his due"⁶. Neither the rights of Alexandria and Antioch⁷ nor the primacy of so many metropolitans⁸ should be so lightly sacrificed.' With our eye upon the ambition of Leo and his successors, pursued no less than that of Anatolius at the expense of other sees, and upon the losses to the papacy consequent upon it, we cannot but note an irony in reading of Leo as champion of the rights of other prelates. But this was the only line open to him: to get the obnoxious canon invalidated by an appeal to the authority of Nicaea. 'Let me urge it upon your holinesses,' he wrote, 21 March 453, to the bishops who had been present at Chalcedon,⁹ 'that the rights of churches must remain just as they were ordained by the three hundred and eighteen divinely-inspired Fathers.'¹⁰ He does not, it will be observed, appeal to the principles of papalism¹¹ in order to get the canon cancelled, as if it set up a second pope at Constantinople

¹ *Ep. civ.* § 2.² *Ibid.*, § 5.³ *Ep. cv.* § 3.⁴ *Ep. cvi.* § 2.⁵ *Ibid.*, § 4.⁶ *Ep. civ.* § 3.⁷ *Ep. cvi.* § 5.⁸ *Ep. cv.* § 2.⁹ *Ep. cxiv*; Jaffé, No. 490.¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op. i.* 1197; *P. L.* liv. 1029 B).¹¹ Denny, *Papalism*, § 442.

and so sinned against the Divine Constitution of the Church. He simply appeals to Eastern veneration for the Council of Nicaea, and in such terms as to enlist upon his side the jealousy which Alexandria and Antioch might be expected to feel against 'sixty years' ¹ successful encroachment by an upstart rival. The appeal fell on deaf ears. But the quarrel was embarrassing to the Government, and so had to be composed. On the one hand, the *Tome* of Leo was widely resented, and the Government had to bring troops into the field to get the doctrinal decisions of the Council obeyed. On the other hand, its administrative rearrangements were disallowed by the Pope. A *rapprochement* of some sort became imperative. At last, in reply to an appeal of 15 February 453 from the Emperor, ² Leo, on his part, was induced to declare, 21 March, that, so far as the Faith was concerned, he expressly approved of the Council of Chalcedon, ³ without being required to desist from his protest in favour of the canons of Nicaea. ⁴ Anatholius, in his turn, was encouraged to assert the rank and the jurisdiction lately conferred upon him, while the need for Leo's assent was ignored. ⁵

§ 14. There remained the Imperial confirmation of the Council. ⁶ At the sixth session, where the Emperor himself was present, he had already given sanction to the Chalcedonian *Definition*, as soon as it was read, by *Si quis igitur*, forbidding public disputation against it. The Council met with resistance in Egypt and Palestine, and the prohibition was both reaffirmed and extended in a series of confirmatory enactments. By *Tandem aliquando* ⁷ of 7 February 452, the operative clause of which began *Nemo vel clericus vel militaris*, it was made illegal for 'cleric or soldier or person of any condition to raise disputes' in matter of religion. 'It is impious and sacrilegious,' says the Emperor, 'where so many bishops have decided to reopen the question to private judgement.' Little attention, however, was paid to the edict by the citizens of Constantinople for whom it was intended. It was, therefore repeated in *Venerabilem catholicæ* ⁸ of 13 March to a wider

¹ *Ep.* cv, § 2.

² *Beatitudinem tuam* = Leo, *Ep.* cx (*Op.* i. 1181 sqq.; *P. L.* liv. 1017 sqq.).

³ Leo, *Ep.* cxiv, § 1 (*Op.* i. 1195; *P. L.* liv. 1029).

⁴ *Ibid.*, § 2 (*Op.* i. 1197 sqq.; *P. L.* liv. 1029 sqq.).

⁵ Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 856 (*E. Tr.* iii. 448); L. Duchesne, *Églises séparées*, 194; Denny, *Papalism*, § 446.

⁶ Fleury, xxviii. xxxiv; Hefele, *Conciles*, II. ii. 844-6 (*E. Tr.* iii. 438-41).

⁷ *Conc. Chalc.* iii, No. 3 (*Mansi*, vii. 475-8).

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 4 (*Mansi*, vii. 477-80).

audience. On 6 July, the rescript *Gloria nunquam*¹ reversed the approbation by Theodosius II of Eutyches and the *Latrocinium*,² and vindicated the memory of Flavian while acquitting the persons of Theodoret and Eusebius of Dorylaeum: and the series was completed by *Amplae omnipotenti*³ of 8 July, which finally ordains, under severe penalties, that the Council of Chalcedon shall be obeyed. The first of these four enactments alone has had lasting importance. Embodied, as it was, by Justinian into his *Codex*⁴ and supplemented by him in his *Novels*,⁵ it set up the First Four Councils as the civilian⁶ standard of orthodoxy for subsequent ages. This standard was ousted for a time by the standard of the canonists, with whom papal took the place of conciliar orthodoxy. 'He is accounted a heretic', they held, 'who does not hold that which is taught and followed by the Holy Roman Church.'⁷ But, in the sixteenth century, when the Civil Law once more came to its own,⁸ the ancient and conciliar standard of Catholicism was pressed upon Charles V by the papal legate at the Diet of Augsburg as reason sufficient for treating Luther as a heretic⁹; while in England it became, by the legislation of Henry VIII¹⁰ and Elizabeth,¹¹ what it is to this day, the rule of orthodoxy and the guarantee to the Church of England of her doctrinal continuity and Catholicity.

¹ *Conc. Chalc.* iii, No. 11 (Mansi, vii. 497-500).

² *Ibid.* iii, No. 10 (Mansi, vii. 495-8).

³ *Ibid.* iii, No. 12 (Mansi, vii. 501-6).

⁴ *Nemo clericus*, Just. *Codex*, i. i. 4; *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ii. 6 (edd. Th. Mommsen u. P. Krüger).

⁵ Just. *Novellae*, 131, § 1 (ii. 267; Teubner, 1881); A. D. 545.

⁶ These decisions were 'the one set of canons which all the Civilians recognized as having the force of law', A. J. Carlyle, *Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, ii. 79.

⁷ 'Omnino censetur haereticus qui non tenet id quod docet ac sequitur Sancta Romana Ecclesia,' Lyndwood [A. D. 1443], *Provinciale*, v. v. 292 (Oxoniae, 1679).

⁸ The three R's—Renaissance, Reformation, Reception [*sc.* of the Civil Law] went together in England under Henry VIII: see F. W. Maitland, *English Law and the Renaissance* (1901); A. F. Pollard, *Cranmer*, 178, n. 1, and *Henry VIII*, 362, n. 2.

⁹ B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, No. 117.

¹⁰ 25 Henry VIII, c. xii, § 7 (*Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 455), of 1534; *The Ten Articles* of 1536 (C. Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith under Henry VIII*, p. xviii); *The Bishops' Book* of 1537 (*ibid.* 62); *The King's Book* of 1543 (*ibid.* 227).

¹¹ The Act of Supremacy, 1 Eliz., c. i, § 36 [A. D. 1558], and the Canon, *De Concionatoribus* of 1571 (H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents illustrative of English Church History*, 455, 476 sq.).

CHAPTER XVII

THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALENTINIAN III, 425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA, 425-†50: (i) THE BARBARIAN INVASIONS; (ii) IRELAND

§ 1. THE death of Honorius, 26 August 423, was followed by the usurpation of John, a clerk in the Government offices, who set himself up at Ravenna and ruled for eighteen months. Galla Placidia, sister of Honorius, and Empress as widow of Constantius his colleague in 421, took refuge with her children, Honoria, *b.* 418, and Valentinian, *b.* 419, at Constantinople. She threw herself for protection¹ on her nephew, Theodosius II, 408-†50, much as her grandmother, Justina, as widow of Valentinian I, 364-†75, had fled, 387, before the usurper Maximus, and given Placidia's mother, the Empress Galla to be wife of Theodosius the Great as the price of his intervening to restore her brother,² Valentinian II, 375-†92, to the throne of the West. Placidia's entreaties took effect; and Theodosius II sent an expedition to reinstate his little cousin. His generals deposed John³; and Galla Placidia, re-established at Ravenna, ruled the Western Empire thence for a quarter of a century, 425-†50⁴ as regent for her son, Valentinian III, 425-†55. He was 'idle and pleasure-loving', reproducing only the weaker features of the Theodosian character. The power, therefore, that his mother wielded during his minority she retained after he had grown to manhood and until her own death.⁵

I

The Empire, under her rule, was repeatedly reduced by the barbarian invasions.

§ 2. Placidia has been called 'the man of her family'⁶; for, so long as she lived, the soil of Italy remained inviolate. Alaric

¹ Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, I. ii. 844; *Dynasty of Theodosius*, 176.

² Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, I. ii. 464.

³ Ibid. 847 sq.

⁴ Ibid. 851.

⁵ Hodgkin, *Dynasty*, 178. For the reign of Valentinian III, see Gibbon, cc. xxxiii-xxxv (iii. 394 sqq.); and for the families of Valentinian I and Theodosius I, the tables in Hodgkin, *Dynasty*, xiv sq.

⁶ Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, I. ii. 885.

had smitten it in his three sieges of Rome, 408–10; but for forty years, from his disappearance to her death, no barbarian set foot in Italy. Elsewhere, from that epoch and under the patriciate first, 410–23, of her husband, Constantius, and then of her general, Aetius,¹ 423–†54, the Imperial territories beyond Italy fell a prey to a succession of invaders who parcelled them out into barbarian kingdoms, sometimes in nominal dependence upon Ravenna, but really independent.

§ 3. Thus in 407 the 'Diocese of Britain' was lost to the Empire, when the 'tyrant' Constantine crossed with his troops into Gaul.² Britain, overrun since 449 by Jutes, Saxons, and Angles, in time became England; but not before it had sent out St. Patrick as apostle of the neighbouring Ireland which had never been included in the Empire.

§ 4. About the same time, a host of Vandals, Sueves, and Alans (the two first of Teutonic origin and the third of Turanian³) made their appearance. They crossed the Rhine, 31 December 406,⁴ and swept over Gaul.⁵ They did not stay there; but, bursting through the passes of the Pyrenees on Michaelmas Eve,⁶ 409, they surged onwards into Spain, and so left the regions behind them free for the settlements of the Visigoths in Aquitaine. Alaric's invasions of Italy,⁷ like the Visigothic inroads into Greece, left no permanent traces there. His brother-in-law and successor, Ataulf,⁸ 410–†15, who, in one of the sieges of Rome, had carried off Galla Placidia, drew off the Gothic hosts, 412, into Gaul. Here he married his captive, 414, at Narbonne; but was murdered the following year: and his successor, Wallia, 415–†18 made a treaty of peace with the Emperor by restoring to him his sister.⁹ The Visigoths were at that time engaged, from Barcelona, the capital of the first Visigothic kingdom, 413–19, in conflict with Vandals and Alans in Spain. In return for their services they received from Honorius large grants of territory in south-west Gaul, consisting of Aquitania II, the northern part of Narbonensis, and a portion of Novem-

¹ Hodgkin, *Italy*, &c., I. ii. 874 sqq.; *Dynasty*, 178 sq.

² Hodgkin, *Italy*, I. ii. 741.

³ *Ibid.* I. ii. 739.

⁴ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 406 (*Op.* 739; *P. L.* li. 590 A).

⁵ Jerome, *Ep.* cxxiii, § 16 (*Op.* i. 913 sq.; *P. L.* xxii. 1057 sq.), and Document No. 148.

⁶ Hodgkin, *Italy*, &c., I. ii. 824.

⁷ Gibbon, c. xxxi (iii. 285 sqq.).

⁸ For whom, and for his policy of restoring the Roman power, see Orosius, *Hist.* vii, § 43 (*Op.* 585; *P. L.* xxxi. 1172 B).

⁹ *Ibid.* (*Op.* 586; *P. L.* xxxi. 1173 B).

populana. Thus came into being the second Visigothic kingdom, 419–57, with its capital at Toulouse.¹ It was a kingdom recognized by the Court of Ravenna: so that Gaul remained, in theory, imperial. For ten years, 419–29, Theodoric I, 419–†51, the son of Alaric, and Rome continued at peace. Then followed a decade of strife, 429–39; but for the rest of his ‘prosperous reign’² the fear of invasion by the Huns drew Roman and Visigoth together, till, in the battle of the Mauriac Plain,³ at Méry-sur-Seine⁴—commonly known as the battle of Châlons—July 451, Aetius, the general of Valentinian III, in concert with Theodoric who perished on the field, drove Attila⁵ out of Gaul. It was the supreme effort of the Romans. Valentinian, out of jealousy, murdered Aetius, 454, with his own hand.⁶ ‘What think you of the deed?’ he asked one of his courtiers. ‘Sire,’ was the reply, ‘you have used your left hand to cut off your right.’⁷ And so it proved: for, now that Aetius was gone, the field lay open in the West to the Visigoths. Under Theodoric II,⁸ 453–†66, the Visigoths, in league⁹ with the new Emperor Avitus, 455–†6, and with the Burgundians, established since 437 in the valley of the Rhone, conquered Spain,¹⁰ 456; and, by the end of our period, their realm extended from the Loire to the Straits of Gibraltar, except for the enfeebled kingdom of the Sueves¹¹ to the north-west of Spain in what was Gallaecia. Such was the third Visigoth kingdom, 460–510, with its capital at Toledo. But within half a century after Euric,¹² 466–†85, by the acquisition of Auvergne,¹³ 475, and Provence, 480,¹⁴ from the Empire, had raised the power of the Visigoths to its height, c. 490, they began to decline. All that

¹ Gibbon, c. xxxi (iii. 350).

² Ibid., c. xxxv (iii. 450).

³ Ibid., c. xxxv (iii. 464); Hodgkin, ii. 124 sqq.

⁴ For this identification, see Gibbon, c. xxxv (app. 28, iii. 507 sq.); Hodgkin, ii. 143 sqq. Méry-sur-Seine is about 20 m. north-west of Troyes.

⁵ For Attila, see Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 133–77; Hodgkin, ii. 1–181, and *Dynasty of Theodosius*, c. vi.

⁶ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 251; Fleury, xxvii. lv; Gibbon, c. xxxv (iii. 476 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 195 sq.

⁷ Procopius, *De bello Vandalico*, i, § 4 (Teubner, 1905), published 550–1.

⁸ For a description of him, see Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* i, § 2 (*Op.* 2; *P. L.* lviii. 445–50); tr. Hodgkin, ii. 352 sqq.

⁹ Hodgkin, ii. 381.

¹⁰ Gibbon, c. xxxvi (Hodgkin, ii. 388 sq.); in 451, four Germanic nations were supreme in Western Europe: (1) Vandals, in Africa, capital, Carthage; (2) Visigoths in south-west France, capital, Toulouse; (3) Burgundians, in Rhone Valley, capital, Lyons; and (4) Sueves, in south and west Spain, capital, Astorga; Hodgkin, ii. 381.

¹¹ Hodgkin, ii. 389.

¹² Ibid. 484: for a sketch of him, see Sidonius, *Ep.* vii, § 6 (*Op.* 183; *P. L.* lviii. 571 A).

¹³ Ibid. 491 sq.

¹⁴ Ibid. 492.

was Visigothic north of the Pyrenees was conquered by Clovis, 481-†511, in a religious war of Catholic Frank against Arian Visigoth¹; and the Visigothic power was confined to, but consolidated in, Spain. Towards the end of the sixth century they abandoned their Arianism for an ardent Catholicism²; in the seventh, an elective monarchy, with power in the hands of nobles and ecclesiastics, reduced their cohesion; and early in the eighth they fell before the Mohammedan invader,³ 711. To this Gaul, part Roman, part Visigothic, belong three names of interest in ecclesiastical history; Hilary,⁴ bishop of Arles 429-†49; Germanus,⁵ bishop of Auxerre 418-†48; and Sidonius Apollinaris,⁶ 430-†89, son-in-law of the Emperor Avitus,⁷ imperial functionary, country gentleman, and bishop of Clermont-Ferrand 472-†89, who was the centre of a literary circle in Auvergne; and, as an authority for the inner life of the Western Empire in the days of its decline,⁸ is the best set-off to men like Orosius and Salvian.

§ 5. The mention of Orosius and Salvian carries us in thought to Africa and its invasion by the Vandals⁹; for Orosius fled thither before their earlier irruption into Spain, and Salvian, c. 400-†80, a presbyter of Marseilles, is a chief authority for the vices of Carthage which delivered that city into their hands. For twenty years, the Vandals, since their passage of the Pyrenees, had maintained an unequal contest with the Visigoths for the possession of Spain.¹⁰ They were, like their rivals, a German people; and came originally from between the Vistula and the Oder. Thence they penetrated into the region between the

¹ Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ii, § 37 (*Op.* 92; *P. L.* lxxi. 233 B); Gibbon, c. xxxviii (iv. 114 sqq.); Hodgkin, iii. 357.

² H. Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, c. v.

³ *Cambr. Med. Hist.* ii. 371 sq.

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 36-96; Fleury, xxvi. xliv, li, xxvii. iv-vi.

⁵ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 1-29; Fleury, xxv. xv-xviii, xxvii. vii, viii.

⁶ Hodgkin, ii. 297 sqq.

⁷ See table in *ibid.* 375.

⁸ S. Dill, *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire*, 187 sqq., 323 sqq.; C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches*, 57 sqq.

⁹ Our authorities for the Vandal conquest are (1) Procopius, *fl.* 500-60, in his *De bello Vandalico* (Teubner, 1905). The war was that in which Belisarius, the general of Justinian, overthrew the Vandal kingdom, 533-4. Procopius was his military secretary, and in Bk. I, cc. i-vii, he gives an account of the foundation of the Vandal kingdom by Gaiseric; (2) Victor, bishop of Vita in Byzacena, who wrote, c. 486, his *Historia persecutionis Africanæ provinciae temporibus Gaisericæ et Hunerici regum Vandalorum* (*P. L.* lviii. 179-276; or *C. S. E. L.* vii); Hodgkin, ii. 209-11.

¹⁰ For their doings in Spain, the authority is the Spaniard Idacius, bishop of Aquæ Flaviæ (Chaves), 427, who continued the *Chronicle* of Jerome to 468 in his *Chronicon* (*P. L.* li. 873-90).

Theiss and the Danube. From Constantine they received settlements in Pannonia; much as afterwards their then neighbours the Visigoths were allowed to settle in Moesia under Valens, 364-†78. Here these kindred peoples became Christians and Arians; for Arian Christianity had long been influential on the line of the Danube, and had devoted missionaries such as Ulfilas. The Vandal settlements were ceded, before 448, by Valentinian III to the Huns; and, after the downfall of Attila's successor in the battle of the Nedao,¹ 454, they passed to the Ostrogoths. But they had long been deserted; for when the lust of wandering to Westward seized all the Germanic peoples, at the opening of the fifth century, the Vandals, crossing first the Rhine, 406, and then the Pyrenees, 409, spread over Spain,² where they appear in two tribes, the Asdings and the Silings. The Asdings settled with the Sueves in Gallaecia and part of Lusitania, while the Silings passed further south and occupied Baetica,³ 410-16. The Silings, however, were driven out by the Visigoths, 417-19, and Baetica was restored to the Empire. But Honorius could not hold it; for the Asdings, having quarrelled with the Sueves, seized upon it,⁴ and for ten years dwelt there, 419-29, till the quarrels of the Romans laid open to the Vandals a region of the Empire where, with no rivals of their own kindred in the field, the spoils would be all their own. The region was Africa, a tempting prize.

Africa contained seven provinces⁵; westernmost of which lay (1) Mauretania Tingitana, now Tangier. It was a province 'separated by two hundred miles of roadless desert from its neighbour of the East'⁶; and this explains not only why it was reckoned with Spain, but also why it was not touched by the Vandal conquest. They left it to the Moors; and, to avoid the desert route, took ship, not across the Straits of Gibraltar, as is commonly supposed, but to some point near Caesarea, or the modern Algiers. Next came the six provinces of the Diocese of Africa; and of these (2) Mauretania Caesariensis and (3) Mauretania Sitifensis covered about two-thirds of the Algiers of to-day. They were rich in cornlands; but not here lay the wealth of Africa, nor in (7) Tripolitana, now Tripoli, the easternmost

¹ Gibbon, c. xxxv (iii. 475); Hodgkin, iii. 193.

² Gibbon, c. xxxiii (iii. 400 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 209 sqq.; *Dynasty of Theodosius*, c. vii.

³ Hodgkin, ii. 222 sq.

⁴ Ibid. 224.

⁵ Ibid. 232 sqq.

⁶ Ibid. 233.

province of all. The three central provinces of (4) Numidia, (5) Africa Proconsularis, or Zeugitana, and (6) Byzacena, or the region roughly corresponding to what is now Tunis, formed the *focus* of Roman civilization in Africa, with Carthage for its capital. To Carthage, therefore, 'as to another Rome in the world of Africa',¹ the Vandals, invited, as we have seen, by Boniface, Count of Africa, 422-†32, shaped their course. Led by their young king, Gaiseric, 428-†77, who was 'quicker in striking', we are told, 'than any one else in making up his mind to strike',² they set sail, May 428. By the beginning of 430 three cities only remained inviolate: Cirta (or Constantine), Hippo, and Carthage. We do not know when Cirta fell; but Hippo, where Augustine lay dying, and Boniface his friend and the betrayer of his country was shut up with him, stood fourteen months' blockade, May 430 to July 431 till, pressed by famine, the Vandals raised the siege. A treaty was concluded, 11 February 435, between Gaiseric and Valentinian III, the net result of which was that, while Carthage remained to the Empire, the authority of the Vandal was legitimated over the regions he had already conquered.³ Then suddenly Gaiseric seized Carthage, 19 October 439, and the Vandals were masters of an independent Africa. Politically, Gaiseric made of Carthage what Carthage had been in the Punic Wars—the rival of Rome. He made it also the scourge of the Roman Empire on the northern shores of the Mediterranean. For, in spite of a second treaty,⁴ 442, Sicily passed over to the Vandal dominion; and in 455 Gaiseric captured Rome. An elderly Senator, Petronius Maximus, profited by the murder of Valentinian III, in March 455, for violating his wife, and became Emperor in his place.⁵ He forced the widowed Empress Eudoxia to marry him. She took her revenge by calling in the Vandals,⁶ as Boniface had summoned them, in self-protection, to Africa five and twenty years before. So Gaiseric appeared at the gates of Rome, May to June 455. Pope Leo went out to meet him, as three years earlier he had confronted Attila south of the Lago di Garda. At the Pope's

¹ Salvian, *De gub. Dei*, § 67 (*C. S. E. L.* viii. 177).

² Quoted in Hodgkin, ii. 229; q.v. for a description of Gaiseric.

³ Prosper, *Chronicon* [A. D. 435] (*Op.* 745; *P. L.* li. 596 B); Gibbon, c. xxxiii, n. 36 (iii. 409).

⁴ *Ibid.* [A. D. 442] (*Op.* 748; *P. L.* li. 599 sq.).

⁵ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 252 sq.; Fleury, xxvii. lv. The dynasty of Theodosius came to an end with the death of Valentinian III.

⁶ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 260; Hodgkin, ii. 204, 282.

intercession, he consented to spare the lives of the citizens, to protect the buildings from flames, and the captives from torture ; but he would plunder the city. In the pillage, which lasted a fortnight, the Vandals carried off the sacred vessels of the Temple which Titus had brought from Jerusalem,¹ as well as statues and precious metals from the temples of pagan Rome. They took with them the Empress Eudoxia, with her daughters Placidia and Eudocia, and a multitude of captives : and returned to Carthage.² Eudocia was married to Huneric, successor to Gaiseric in the Vandal kingdom, 477–†84, a miserable union, for the one was a devout Catholic and the other a bitter Arian. She was thus the second princess of the house of Theodosius to be given to a barbarian from Germany : her grandmother, Galla Placidia, having similarly been carried off from Rome to become the Queen of Ataulf the Visigoth. The other captives were left to the charity of Deogratias, the archbishop of Carthage, 454–†8. He sold the church-plate for their benefit,³ and lodged them in the churches.⁴ Africa then became the scene of the Vandal persecution, and of the overthrow of the Catholic Church there by its Arian oppressors.⁵

II

We may now turn to the ecclesiastical history of the lands invaded by the barbarians⁶ ; and first to Britain where, shortly before the Roman occupation came to an end, was born, c. 389, St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland.⁷

§ 6. So entirely has the fame of Patrick with posterity eclipsed that of all other missionaries to Ireland, that it is necessary to

¹ They remained at Carthage till 534, when Belisarius carried them to Constantinople. Justinian sent them back to Jerusalem, where they must have been at its capture by Omar. Thus they survived the fall of three great cities—Jerusalem, Rome, and Carthage, Hodgkin, iii. 625.

² Prosper, *Chronicon* [A. D. 455] (*Op.* 754 ; *P. L.* li. 605 sq.), and Document No. 218.

³ Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Exuperius.

⁴ Victor Vitensis, *De persecutione Vandalica*, i, § 8 (*Op.* 7 ; *P. L.* lviii. 191 sq.) ; Fleury, xxvii. lvii.

⁵ One effect of the oppression was the breakdown of synodical action in the Church of Africa, for which see Fleury, xxvii. lviii, lix ; H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, ii. 156, 161 sq.

⁶ Cf. 'The Church and the Barbarian Invaders' in W. Bright, *The Roman See*, &c., 310–56.

⁷ Cf. 'The Celtic Churches in the British Isles,' *ibid.* 367 sqq. ; J. B. Bury, *The life of St. Patrick* (1905) ; and, for the more important sources, A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, II. ii.

observe that, so far from Patrick having been the first to bring the Gospel thither, there was a period of Christianity in Ireland before his day. How long it had been there, we cannot say; but, as to the source from which Irish Christianity came, there can be little doubt. Prosper speaks of 'the Roman island' and 'the barbaric'¹ in such a way as to suggest intercourse between them—a suggestion borne out, for instance, by the fact that legions were stationed on the estuaries of the Severn and the Dee to hold in check 'the 'barbaric' raiders. There are traces in Ireland, before St. Patrick, of a few Christian communities scattered up and down the country,² and it is probable that they owed their faith to Britain. Two generations before his day we have traces of Irish, then called Scotie, Christians. Thus Mansuetus, first bishop of Toul, 350, was an Irish Scot³; and possibly Caelestius,⁴ who is spoken of in 415 by Jerome⁵ as an Irish Scot, may have been a Christian before he left Ireland. At any rate, about the time of the visit of Germanus and Lupus to put down Pelagianism in Britain, Pope Caelestine became aware that there were in Ireland 'Scots who believed in Christ'.⁶ The news may have reached him through Germanus and his deacon (if, indeed, he was his, and not Caelestine's deacon⁷), Palladius. It was Palladius who, according to Prosper, had prompted Caelestine to send Germanus to Britain⁸; though Prosper omits to notice, what is told us by Constantius, the biographer of Germanus, that the mission was dispatched by a Gallic synod in response to a request from British bishops.⁹ The two accounts are not incompatible¹⁰; the Britons may have made their appeal to 'Auxerre' and 'Auxerre may well have enlisted the intervention of Rome'.¹¹ Anyhow, Palladius enlisted the interest of Caelestine in keeping Britain orthodox; and, if he accompanied Germanus, as his deacon, on that errand, he may well have come across

¹ Prosper, *Contra Collatorem*, xxi, § 2 (*Op.* 363; *P. L.* li. 271 c).

² Bury, app. 10, and esp. Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 431 (*Op.* 744; *P. L.* li. 595 B); and 'ad plebem nuper (not 'primum') venientem ad credulitatem' of Patrick, *Confessio* (H. and S. II. ii. 307).

³ H. and S. II. ii. 289.

⁴ If the reference is to him, and not to Pelagius; so H. and S. II. ii. 290, note a.

⁵ Jerome, *Comm. in Ier.* lib. iii, praef. (*Op.* iv. 923-4; *P. L.* xxiv. 758).

⁶ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 431 (*ut sup.*).

⁷ Bury, 297.

⁸ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 429 (*Op.* 744; *P. L.* li. 594 sq.).

⁹ *Vita*, § 41 (*Acta SS.* [31 July], tom. vii, Iul. 211 E); written c. 480, Bury, 247 sq.

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 15.

¹¹ Bury, 297.

deputies from the orthodox Christian communities of Ireland¹ and have been the means of interesting the Pope in their case too. Caelestine was concerned for their welfare and orthodoxy, not primarily for the conversion of their heathen fellow-countrymen; and if, as we may suppose, they had asked for guidance, he would have been acting in strict accordance with his well-known maxim, that 'bishops were to be given to flocks willing to receive them',² by sending the Irish a bishop. In 431 he consecrated Palladius, and sent him to Ireland. The mission of Palladius is significant.³ It marks the first entry of Ireland into the family of Western churches which looked up to Rome. But it was a mission with limitations. Limited in purpose to the building up of existing communities of Christians in Ireland, it was limited also in effect; for, after Palladius had landed at Wicklow and done a few months' work in the country behind that port, his efforts were cut short by death.

§ 7. The successor of Palladius was St. Patrick,⁴ whose episcopate probably lasted⁵ 432-†461.

The primary authorities for his life are four, and all belong to the fifth century. There is (1) his *Confession*⁶ [*sc.* of the praises of God, as shown in his life], a rude autobiography written towards the end of his days; (2) his *Letter to the Christian subjects of the tyrant Corotic*,⁷ a 'British king'⁸; (3) a hymn called *The Breastplate*⁹ which, if not his, at least is 'of importance for the spirit of early Christianity in Ireland'¹⁰; and (4) the circular *letter of Patrick and two other bishops*¹¹ to the clergy, embodying rules for ecclesiastical discipline. To these contemporary documents may

¹ Bury, 53.

² *Ep.* iv, § 7 (*P. L.* l. 434 B).

³ Bury, 54 sqq.

⁴ Works in *P. L.* liii. 801-40.

⁵ For the chronology of the life of St. Patrick, see Bury, app. C, excursus, 3, 5, 20.

⁶ Text in Whitley Stokes, *Tri-partite life of St. Patrick*, ii. 357-75; H. and S. II. ii. 296-313, or *Libri S. Patricii*, ed. N. J. D. White (S.P.C.K. 1918); tr. in *The Latin writings of St. Patrick*, by N. J. D. White (S.P.C.K. 1918); for its genuineness, Bury, 225 sqq.; for the name, see §§ 61, 62. Its purpose was not to hide 'the gift of God' (*ibid.*, § 62), but 'to declare the wonderful dealings of God with himself, as a sort of repayment' [*retributio*, *ibid.*, § 3], Bury, 198. Patrick uses it in the same sense as Augustine, *Conf.* v, § 1 (*Op.* i. 107 E; *P. L.* xxxi. 705), Document No. 229.

⁷ Text in Stokes, ii. 375-80; H. and S. II. ii. 314-19; *Lib. S. Pat.* 26-32; tr. in *Latin writings of St. P.* 26-32; for its genuineness, Bury, 227 sq., Document No. 230.

⁸ The seat of his government at Ail Cluade (the Rock of Clyde), near Dumbarton (Dun na m-Bretan=the fort of the Britons), Bury, 190 sq.

⁹ Text [Irish and English] in H. and S. II. ii. 320-3.

¹⁰ Bury, 246.

¹¹ Text in H. and S. II. ii. 328-30; 'authentic', Bury, 245.

be added the Latin *Hymn of St. Sechnall*,¹ in praise of his master St. Patrick ; but ‘ as the author confines himself to generalities, the hymn supplies no materials for Patrick’s biography ’.² Mention should also be made of the *Memoirs*³ by Tirechan and of the *Life*⁴ by Muirchu. They are, it is true, of the seventh century, and legendary ; but it is possible to derive from them much that may rank as true history.

§ 8. Patrick, then, was born in Britain about 389, at Bannaventa⁵ : possibly to be identified with one or other of the three places called Banwen,⁶ in Glamorganshire ; and, in any case, close to the western sea.⁷ Bannaventa must also have been near a town with a municipal council ; for Patrick’s father, Calpornius, was a *decurio* or town-councillor as well as a deacon. His father before him had been a priest, by name Politus.⁸ The family was of some little consideration, and had been Christian for two generations, before Patrick was born to Calpornius and his wife, Concessa.⁹ He was brought up in the Christian faith ; but also in the belief that Rome, of which he was ‘ born a freeman ’ and ‘ a citizen ’¹⁰ was everything in the world. But the Empire was breaking down as he grew to manhood ; and in 405, amid the disorders which heralded the withdrawal of the Roman armies from Britain, some Irish pirates made a raid up the Bristol Channel and carried him off, at the age of sixteen, ‘ with thousands more ’ to ‘ the outermost places of the earth ’¹¹ in Ireland. Here he spent six years,¹² 405–11, in slavery, tending cattle¹³ for a master who ‘ lived near the wood of Fochlad, nigh to the western sea ’.¹⁴ Probably the place lay near Croagh Patrick, a mountain by Westport in north-west Connaught.¹⁵ At some time in these six years came the crisis of his life. When barely fifteen, he says, he had committed some sin.¹⁶ In exile and hardship it came home to him, and he was converted. His ‘ love for God, together with awe and faith ’, he tells us, ‘ grew mightily ’¹⁷. But he became

¹ Text in W. Stokes, ii. 386–9 ; H. and S. ii. ii. 324–7.

² Bury, 247.

³ Text in W. Stokes, ii. 302–33 ; discussion in Bury, 278 sqq.

⁴ Text in W. Stokes, ii. 269–301.

⁵ *Conf.*, § 1 (the sections are quoted as given in *Lib. S. P.*, ed. N. J. D. White).

⁶ Bury, Preface, p. x.

⁷ Bury, 322 sqq.

⁸ *Conf.*, § 1.

⁹ Bury, 23, 292.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 24.

¹¹ *Conf.*, § 1.

¹² *Ibid.*, § 16.

¹³ *Ibid.*, § 17.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, § 23.

¹⁵ Bury, 27 sq., 130 sq.

¹⁶ *Conf.*, § 27.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, § 16.

homesick, too ¹; and, at last, contrived to escape. Making for the sea, it may be conjectured, at the then important port of Wicklow where Palladius had landed, Patrick found a ship manned by heathen sailors and ready to sail.² They had a cargo of dogs,³ perhaps of Irish wolf-hounds,⁴ for which there was a demand in Gaul.⁵ There, after three days, they landed; but finding the land laid waste ⁶ (for it was just after the Vandals and Sueves had swept across the country into Spain) they pressed on into Italy ⁷ where, after two months' wandering with the ship's company, Patrick succeeded again in making his escape. He is next found at Lerins,⁸ 411-14; and thence, at last, he got home to Britain. His kinsfolk welcomed him 'as a son', and implored him not to leave again.⁹ But he could not rest. A man named Victoricus appeared to him in a dream, with a letter in his hand beginning, 'The voice of the Irish'. Patrick was convinced that it was 'the voice of the folk who lived near to the wood of Fochlad, nigh unto the western sea'. He determined that his life's work lay in carrying the Gospel to them; and, to fit himself for the task (for he constantly bemoans his illiteracy¹⁰), returned to Gaul and placed himself under the direction of the bishop of Auxerre, 415. He was now six and twenty; and here he spent seventeen years, waiting upon the advice of his superiors without ever abandoning his purpose, though, at times they were far from encouraging.¹¹ In the meanwhile he secured a liberal education. Ordained deacon in 418 by the bishop Amator, he saw Germanus, the next bishop, sent to Britain, 429, to put down Pelagianism; and, as a result of that mission, Palladius consecrated first bishop for the Irish, 431. Then came the news to Auxerre of the death of Palladius, and with it the opportunity for which Patrick had waited so long.

§ 9. In 432 he was consecrated by Germanus to be bishop for the Irish.¹² In the course of his 'laborious episcopate',¹³ as he calls it, he laid the foundations of the Christian church in Dalarradia,¹⁴ now Co. Down; in Meath¹⁵; in Connaught,¹⁶ where he

¹ *Conf.*, § 17.² *Ibid.*, § 18.³ *Ibid.*, § 19.⁴ Bury, 31.⁵ *Ibid.*, 34.⁶ *Conf.*, § 19.⁷ 'Per Gallias atque Italiam,' *Dicta Patricii*, No. 1; W. Stokes, ii. 301; probably genuine, see Bury, 35, 228, 341 sq.⁸ 'In insolis quae sunt in mari terreno,' W. S. ii. 301.⁹ *Conf.*, § 23.¹⁰ *Ibid.*, §§ 1, 10, 12, 13.¹¹ *Ibid.*, § 26.¹² Bury, 59, 347 sqq.¹³ *Conf.*, § 26.¹⁴ Bury, c. v.¹⁵ *Ibid.*, c. vi.¹⁶ *Ibid.*, c. vii.

visited as bishop the scene of his captivity in boyhood, and made return for his own conversion there by winning to Christ the folk that dwelt by the wood of Fochlad. At some point in these labours he sought the sympathy and counsel of St. Leo, by a visit to Rome,¹ 441. At Rome, he was 'approved in the Catholic Faith'; and thence he returned, laden with relics of St. Peter and St. Paul, to found, for all the churches he had planted, a centre of ecclesiastical organization at Armagh,² 444. Nor was the south of Ireland—though Christian, in part, before his day—left beyond his influence.³ There are traces of Patrick's influence in Leinster and Munster, while to Leinster he sent two coadjutors, the bishops Auxilius and Iserninus.

§ 10. The conversion of Ireland was thus, in the full sense, Patrick's work; and it was conversion to a Christianity of the type that then prevailed in the Western Empire. Patrick taught the faith of the Nicene Council,⁴ though it is not certain that he had seen its Creed. He introduced the Latin language, sure bond of ecclesiastical union within the Western Empire⁵ and its civilization, though he spoke to the people in their mother tongue.⁶ He observed and perpetuated the threefold ministry; and set up a diocesan episcopate,⁷ though there was a marked tendency to multiply bishops⁸ and treat them as supports of a tribal or monastic authority⁹ rather than as heads of a territorial administration. But it is easy to account for this peculiarity: there were no towns in Ireland.¹⁰ Disciplinary enactments also issued from Patrick and his fellow-bishops¹¹: they included provision for an appeal to Rome, in the sense of a request for a 'decretal'¹² such, e.g., as had been sent to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, or to Victricius and Exuperius, bishops in Gaul. Thus Ireland was brought, by the mission of Patrick, into relations

¹ Bury, 150 sqq., 367 sqq.

² Ibid., 154 sqq.

³ Ibid. 162.

⁴ *Conf.*, § 4.

⁵ 'He did not do for the Scots what Wulfilas did for the Goths, and the Slavonic apostles [Cyril and Methodius] for the Slavs; he did not translate the sacred books of his religion into Irish, or found a national church literature. . . . He diffused a knowledge of Latin in Ireland. . . . The policy was entirely consonant with the development of western, as contrasted with eastern, Christianity,' whence the *unitas ecclesiae* in the West, Bury, 217–20.

⁶ *Conf.*, § 9.

⁷ Ibid. 180, 375 sqq.

⁸ Ibid. 181.

⁹ Ibid. 177–9.

¹⁰ Ibid. 180.

¹¹ 'The Canons of St. Patrick' are in H. and S. II. ii. 328 sqq.; Bury, 166 sqq., 233 sqq.

¹² Letters of advice which gradually became letters of command, *ibid.* 61 sqq.

with the Apostolic See as close as were those of any church in the Western Empire. As to missionary methods, he went straight for the chiefs¹; for, if the chief was won, the whole clan followed him to baptism. Monasteries,² monastic schools,³ and a native ministry⁴ also had their place in his armoury. Nor did he forget to seek support from Christian opinion in Britain: he would have it put pressure on the tyrant Coroticus,⁵ himself a Christian and a Roman, for allying with heathen 'Scots and renegade Picts'⁶ and carrying off his neophytes into captivity.⁷ But the letter in which he throws himself on the support of his fellow-countrymen at home, is sad reading. It betrays his bitter sense of the envy and uncharitableness with which they regarded his successful work in Ireland.⁸ They even went so far as to charge him with making personal profit out of it.⁹ 'Before God and His holy Angels', answers Patrick, 'I never had any motive, save the Gospel and the promises of God, to return at any time to that people from whom I had formerly escaped'.¹⁰ Let his mission, however, have been never so much against the grain, such was the ardour of his sensitive and affectionate nature, that it was an unmixed success.¹¹ 'Patrick', says Dr. Bury, 'did three things. He organized the Christianity which already existed. He converted kingdoms which were still pagan, especially in the West. And he brought Ireland into connexion with the church of the Empire and made it formally part of universal Christendom.'¹² He was, moreover, one of the most efficient of those who took part in spreading the Christian Faith beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire. Like Augustine and Boniface, but unlike Columba, Patrick was 'the bearer of the Roman idea'. But 'the Roman idea', in his day, 'meant not the idea of subjection to the Roman See, but of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire'.¹³ Into this fraternity of Roman churches, Ireland, alongside of Britain,¹⁴ found introduction by the labours of the one British missionary, St. Patrick. He died in the year 461; and was buried at Saul,¹⁵ on Strangford Lough, in Co. Down.

¹ Bury, 173.² Ibid. 171, 174 sqq.³ Ibid. 179.⁴ Ibid. 173.⁵ Ibid. 187 sqq.⁶ *Epistola*, § 2.⁷ *Ep.* §§ 3, 14, 15, 19.⁸ *Ep.*, §§ 1, 12.⁹ *Conf.*, §§ 48-50; *Ep.*, § 10.¹⁰ *Conf.*, § 61.¹¹ *Conf.*, § 41; *Ep.*, § 12.¹² Bury, 212.¹³ Ibid. 221.¹⁴ Hence the point of his wrath with Coroticus and his Christian subjects, *Ep.*, § 16; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 621.¹⁵ Bury, 207.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALENTINIAN III,
425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA,
425-†50 : (iii) GAUL ; (iv) SPAIN ; (v) AFRICA

WE now pass to events contemporary with St. Patrick.

I

And, first, in Gaul.¹ They illustrate (i) the organization of the Church ; (ii) the state of intelligence and piety ; and (iii) the social conditions of that country in the first half of the fifth century. They are connected with the names of Hilary of Lerins and of Sidonius Apollinaris.

(i) The organization of the Church in Gaul had hardly taken definite shape before A.D. 400. There had, it is true, been Councils, but no metropolitan ; the presiding prelate being chosen on personal grounds.

§ 1. At Arles, in 314, the president was Marinus, bishop of Arles, under instruction from Constantine. At Arles again in 353 and at Béziers, 356, he was Saturninus, bishop of Arles, the Arian satellite of Constantius. At Valentia (Valence) ² in 374, Phoebadius, bishop of Agennum (Agen) ³ presided,⁴ as the most influential prelate present. Vienne and Arles, however, were already in strife for precedence ⁵ ; and, as the former was the civil capital of the Seven Provinces—Viennensis, Narbonensis I and II, Aquitania I and II, Novempopulana and Alpes Maritimæ—the bishop of Vienne was accorded some deference. Now Valentia was in his province, while Agennum lay in Aquitania II. The bishop of Agen, therefore, presided as Phoebadius : the opponent, no less distinguished than Hilary of Poitiers had been, of that governmental Arianism which the Court desired to impose upon Gaul ; and the era of metropolitans had not yet dawned. But a quarter of a century later, at the Council of Turin, 400, Vienne and Arles are found at issue over

¹ T. S. Holmes, *The Church in Gaul* (1911).

² Valence is on the left bank of the Rhone, between Lyons and Marseilles.

³ Agen is in south-west France, on the right bank of the Garonne. Its bishopric was founded c. 303, and is in the province of Bordeaux.

⁴ Mansi, iii. 491 sqq.

⁵ Fleury, xxi. lii.

metropolitical rights in Viennensis.¹ Arles had ancient claims as the ecclesiastical metropolis²; but, about that time Arles had succeeded to Trèves (which had been overwhelmed by the barbarians)³ as the capital of Gaul and the residence of the Praetorian Prefect, while at Arles the assembly of the Seven Provinces came to be held. Heros became bishop of Arles, 409–12, and the protégé of the British-born usurper Constantine,⁴ 407–†11. No sooner was Constantine disposed of by the patrician Constantius, who won back Arles for the Empire in 411,⁵ than the victor got rid of Heros. He went off with Lazarus, bishop of Aix, to figure as accuser of Pelagius, 415, in Palestine; while Constantius intruded into the see an adventurer named Patroclus, 412–†26. In the winter of 416–17 Patroclus went to Rome—for bishops of Gaul already knew their way thither—to make interest, under the auspices of his patron Constantius, now brother-in-law of the Emperor,⁶ for the recognition of Arles as the seat of an archbishop. Its ecclesiastical dignity, he would urge, should not lag behind its new civil rank. Zosimus, at that moment, had just succeeded, 18 March, 417, to Innocent I in the Roman see: a blunderer to a statesman. He was flattered by the suit of Patroclus and his powerful patron; and, in *Placuit apostolicae*⁷ of 22 March, the Pope not only subjected Viennensis, Narbonensis I and II, and Alpes Maritimae to the archbishop of Arles,⁸ but made him Papal Vicar for the whole of Gaul.⁹ Actually, the decision based the ecclesiastical on the new civil status of Arles. But this was a principle which Rome, even under Zosimus, would not admit; and the Pope based his award instead on the pretext that the pioneer of Christianity at Arles had been Trophimus a Roman missionary,¹⁰ and no other than Trophimus the Ephesian and companion of St. Paul.¹¹ Thus Arles was provided with an ‘apostolic’ connexion, and given an authority to the injury of existing rights. For Vienne and Narbonne each ranked as a civil metropolis, and their bishops had exercised authority over the sees in Viennensis and Narbonensis I; while Proculus of

¹ *Conc. Taurin*, c. 2 (Mansi, iii. 861).

² Fleury, xxvii. vi. (iii. 245, note b), and xlv.

³ Gibbon, c. xxx (iii. 270).

⁴ Hodgkin, i. ii. 471; Bury, *St. Patrick*, 329.

⁵ Hodgkin, i. ii. 827.

⁶ He married Galla Placidia, 1 Jan. 417, Hodgkin, i. ii. 840.

⁷ Zosimus, *Ep.* i (*P. L.* xx. 642–5); Jaffé, No. 328.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 1. On this Vicariate of Arles see Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 1173 sqq. It was an attempt against Milan, just as the Vicariate of Thessalonica was a barrier against Constantinople.

¹⁰ Zosimus, *Ep.* i, § 3 (*P. L.* xx. 644 sq.).

¹¹ Acts xxi. 29.

Marseilles, whose see was situate not indeed in a civil metropolis but in a city of commercial importance, exercised an undefined supervision over Narbonensis II. There was resentment and resistance, backed up, moreover, by the Council of Milan,¹ in the autumn of 417; and upon the death first of Zosimus, 26 December 418, and then of Constantius, 2 September 421, Patroclus began to find that his newly acquired authority was but partially secured. The Papal Vicariate collapsed, and the archiepiscopate was curtailed. Nevertheless, the latter survived the death of Patroclus²; and, under his successors, Honoratus, 426–†9, and Hilary, 429–†49, the see of Arles enjoyed an authority over Viennensis, Narbonensis II, and Alpes Maritimae—the region assigned to Patroclus, but *minus* Narbonensis I.

Such was its jurisdiction when, after the brief tenure of Honoratus the founder of Lerins³ and the second archbishop, the see came to be filled by his disciple and kinsman Hilary, archbishop of Arles, 429–†49.

§ 2. Hilary⁴ was born, c. 401, of a noble family⁵; and, after a liberal education, was on the high road to a distinguished career when Honoratus led him to forsake the world⁶ for a life of religious retirement at Lerins.⁷ He followed his patron to Arles; and, being a man of mark as well as of saintly life, he came to be looked upon as the natural successor to Honoratus.⁸ Together, they caused the people to forget Patroclus and give themselves over to a life of devotion. Under the régime of the saintly personages, Arles came to be ‘a place of great edification’.⁹ There Hilary lived the ascetic life. There he preached: sermons that were generally lengthy—the people sat from 12–4 p.m. on fast-days¹⁰—sometimes too lengthy for some of his hearers, for they would slip out discreetly on seeing him get into the pulpit.¹¹ From Arles, as evangelist, he journeyed far and wide; but always on foot. From

¹ T. S. Holmes, 365 sq.

² Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 426 (*Op.* 743; *P. L.* li. 594 A).

³ A. C. Cooper-Marsdin, *The history of the islands of Lerins*, c. viii.

⁴ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 36–97; Fleury, xxiv. lviii, xxvii. iv–vi; Cooper-Marsdin, c. x; Holmes, 453 sqq.; and the *Vita* (written by his disciple Honoratus, who became bishop of Marseilles, 475–†92) in *Acta SS. Maii*, ii. 25–34. This and the works of Hilary are in *P. L.* l. 1213–72: see Bardenhewer, 519 sq.

⁵ *Vita*, § 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 3–6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, § 7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 9.

⁹ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 591.

¹⁰ *Vita*, § 14. Mercifully, this was the custom in Gaul: see Aug. *De cat. rud.*, § 19 (*Op.* vi. 276 F; *P. L.* xl. 325); they stood in Africa, Optatus, *De schism. Don.* iv, § 5 (*Op.* 73; *P. L.* xi. 1032 sq.).

¹¹ *Vita*, § 18.

Arles, too, as archbishop, he kept his suffragans in working order, by assembling them frequently in synod.¹ He was one of the many prelates of those unhappy times who sold the sacred vessels to ransom captives—a custom that should be noted as a step in the redemption of war. Prisoners were once consigned to slavery; now, under the teaching of the Church, they were held to ransom.² In point of doctrine, if Hilary is to be called a semi-Pelagian, this only means that he was an admirer of Augustine who could not go all lengths with him.³ It was not doctrine, however, but discipline which interested Hilary. The extension of the episcopate and the promotion of good men on a vacancy occupied all his energies. But to him, as to Honoratus before him, the good man was the ascetic; specially the ascetic who had been trained at Lerins, or took its ideals for his model. So it was apt to be the monk imported from a distance rather than the cleric trained in the diocese who became its bishop, with the natural result that local feeling rose against Honoratus and Hilary, and soon found its way to Rome.

§ 3. Thus was procured the celebrated decretal of 26 July 428, *Cuperemus quidem*.⁴ We have already referred to it as of interest for the history of the vesture of the clergy in church; and Caelestine, 422–†32, sent it to the bishops of Vienne and Narbonne in answer to complaints of the extravagances and the strictness of the type of bishop who came from Lerins. Similar evidence of a growing breach between bishops and inferior clergy is afforded by *Apostolici verba*⁵ of 15 May 431; which, at the instance of Prosper and another Hilary (Augustinians both), Caelestine dispatched to Venerius, bishop of Marseilles 428–†52, to say that in Provence the clergy preached too much upon high points of doctrine: where, be it noted, they were not zealous enough for the system of Augustine to suit Prosper.

§ 4. Nothing much came of want of sympathy such as this, on either side; but over the case of Celidonius,⁶ Hilary came into collision with the Roman See, 445.

Celidonius was bishop of Vesontio (Besançon), in the province

¹ Councils of Riez, 439; Orange, 441; Vaison, 442: see Hefele, iii. 157–67 (E. Tr.).

² *Vita*, § 11.

³ See the letter of Prosper to Augustine=Aug. *Ep.* ccxxv, § 9 (*Op.* ii. 824 sq.; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1007).

⁴ Caelestine, *Ep.* iv (*P. L.* l. 430–6); Jaffé, No. 369; Fleury, xxiv. lvi.

⁵ *Ibid.* *Ep.* xxi (*P. L.* l. 528–37); Jaffé, No. 381.

⁶ *Vita* § 21; Holmes, 369 sqq.

of Maxima Sequanorum, which had nothing to do with Arles. While a layman, he had married a widow ; and, as a magistrate, had given judgement in capital cases. Hilary, in company with his friend, Germanus of Auxerre, visited Besançon, and for these irregularities assembled a Council¹ and deposed him. Celidonius, like the clergy of southern Gaul just mentioned, sought redress at Rome ; for Gaul, though outside the Roman patriarchate, was not outside the growing influence of the papacy. If Hilary was inclined to exaggerate the powers of his See, Leo was not less bent on subordinating metropolitans to the pope : Celidonius therefore received cordial welcome.² Immediately, Hilary set off to cross the Alps on foot, though it was the depth of winter, and go to Rome. Arrived there, he entered his protest against the ease with which Celidonius had been received into communion by Leo without examination of his case. He even affirmed that the Holy See had no right to review the decisions of Councils in Gaul (for ' he strictly adhered to the Canons of Sardica ' ³), precisely as the Africans had contended for the independence of their synodical judgements in the case of Apiarius. Not that he had come to appeal : he was there simply to let Leo know what *he* conceived to be the rights of the case. This done, Hilary returned, as he had come, unperturbed and afoot.

Leo, of course, was considerably annoyed. He dismissed the charges against Celidonius,⁴ and restored him to Besançon. Then he turned to Hilary, and treated him with an extreme severity. In *Divinae cultum* ⁵ of July 445, addressed to the bishops of the province of Vienne, Leo condemns his hastiness, his high-handed ways, his recourse to the secular arm, and his encroachment on provinces with which he had nothing to do.⁶ ' What business has he there ? Up to the days of Patroclus, none of his predecessors exercised jurisdiction in those regions ; while Patroclus himself only enjoyed it by temporary grant from the Holy See—a grant which has since been revoked, on maturer judgement.'⁷ The bishop of Arles, therefore, could lay no claim to authority beyond the province of Vienne properly so called. As for Hilary, he was to cease to be metropolitan of that province,⁸ and his rights were to be

¹ Hefele, iii. 172 (E. Tr.).² *Vita*, § 22.³ Holmes, 369.⁴ *Ep.* x, § 3 (*Op.* i. 635 ; *P. L.* liv. 631 A).⁵ *Ep.* x (*Op.* i. 633-41 ; *P. L.* liv. 628-36) ; Jaffé, No. 407 ; Fleury, xxvii. v.⁶ *Ibid.*, § 2.⁷ *Ibid.*, § 4.⁸ *Ibid.*, § 7.

transferred to the bishop of Vienne¹; while, presumably, his claims to ordain bishops in Narbonensis II and Alpes Maritimae were to pass respectively to the bishops of Aix and of Embrun. Let him thank the Pope that he has been allowed to retain his bishoprick! Leo can hardly have avoided the consciousness that *his* was the high-handedness now.

§ 5. But from the time of Damasus the popes had known well how to exploit the Imperial Government to their own advantage; and Leo procured, in support of his judgement, the celebrated Rescript of Valentinian III, dated 8 July, 445, beginning *Certum est*.² Reciting the behaviour of Hilary from the papal point of view, it ran as follows:—‘We decree,’ said the Emperor, ‘by this perpetual edict, that it shall not be lawful for the bishops of Gaul or of the other provinces, contrary to ancient custom, to do aught without the authority of the venerable Pope of the Eternal City; and whatsoever the authority of the Apostolic See has enacted, or may hereafter enact, shall be the law for all. So that, if any bishop summoned to trial before the Pope of Rome shall neglect to attend, he shall be compelled to appear by the Governor of the Province; in all respects regard being had to what privileges our deified parents [*sc.* Gratian] conferred on the Roman church.’³ Wherefore your Illustrious and Eminent Magnificence is to cause what is enacted above to be observed in virtue of this present edict and law, and a fine of ten pounds is at once to be levied on any judge who suffers Our Commands to be disobeyed.’ The result of this enactment was to go far beyond the grant of Gratian to which it refers,⁴ and to rivet a papal autocracy on the Western Empire by the whole force of the Civil Law. Not only was Leo’s condemnation of Hilary brought officially, by this rescript, to the cognisance of the patrician Aetius; but should any bishop, in Gaul or elsewhere, be cited by the Pope to appear before him, he must at once obey the summons or, in case of refusal, be constrained by the secular arm to present himself at Rome. It is the crowning proof that the papacy at Rome—as distinct from the primacy⁵ of the

¹ *Ep.* x, § 9, and *Ep.* lxvi, § 2 (*Op.* i. 999; *P. L.* liv. 885 A).

² It=Leo, *Ep.* xi (*Op.* i. 642–4; *P. L.* liv. 636–40).

³ For Gratian’s rescript [*Ordinariae sententiae*, § 6], see Denny, *Papalism*, § 209.

⁴ For the additions made by Valentinian to the powers conferred by Gratian on the Roman bishop, see *ibid.*, §§ 210–11.

⁵ Valentinian says, in this edict, that ‘the primacy of the Apostolic See,

Apostolic See in Christendom—is the creation of the State.¹ As for Hilary, he took no further notice, but confined himself to the charge of his diocese. He sent envoys to appease the wrath of Leo²; and Auxiliarius, a mutual friend of his and of Leo's, now living in retirement at Rome after having served as Praetorian Prefect of Gaul, endeavoured to make peace for him, at the same time bidding Hilary reflect that 'Roman ears are sensitive, but open to deferential language; if your Holiness would but unbend a little in that way, you would lose little and gain much'.³ But Hilary remained till his death, 5 May 449, as unmoved as Leo; and he is now, like Meletius of Antioch, a saint of the Roman Martyrology,⁴ though he died out of communion with the See of Rome.

§ 6. The situation improved with his successor, Ravennius,⁵ 449–†55; for Leo, at that time, was seeking the assent of the West to his *Tome* against Eutyches. He could not afford to forgo the unanimous backing of the church of Gaul; and, in *Lectis dilectionis vestrae*⁶ of 5 May 450, addressed to the comprovincials of Arles (who had written to him to announce the consecration of Ravennius and to protest against the claims of Vienne to 'primacy'⁷), he settled the rivalry between Vienne and Arles by dividing the province into two. Vienne received the northern sees of Valence, Tarantaise, Geneva, and Grenoble as its suffragans; to Arles were assigned the southern sees⁸; while Aix and Embrun, which had temporarily acquired a metropolitanate over Narbonensis II and Alpes Maritimae respectively, were subjected once more to the successors of Hilary.⁹ In return, Milan,¹⁰ Gaul¹¹ and Spain¹² gave in their adherence to the *Tome*; and the Pope, 27 January 452,

due to St. Peter, was confirmed by the authority of a sacred synod', on which see Denny, § 1172.

¹ Denny, § 212; and the well-known words of Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 83, quoting Baronius [1538–†1607], *Annales*, ad ann. 445, § 10, *ad fin* (vii 583).

² *Vita*, § 22

³ *Vita*, § 22.

⁴ *Acta SS. Maii*, vol. ii, p. 24; Praef., § 3.

⁵ Leo, *Ep.* xl (*Op.* i. 890–1; *P. L.* liv. 814 sq.); Jaffé, No. 434; Fleury, xxvii. xlii.

⁶ *Ep.* lxvi (*Op.* i. 998–1000; *P. L.* liv. 883–6); Jaffé, No. 450; Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 93 sq.; Fleury, xxvii. xlv; Holmes, 462.

⁷ *Ep.* lxv, § 2 (*Op.* i. 994 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 880 sq.).

⁸ *Ep.* lxvi, § 2 (*Op.* i. 99; *P. L.* liv. 885 B).

⁹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 86.

¹⁰ This document, of Sept. 451, = Leo, *Ep.* xcvii (*Op.* i. 1080–4; *P. L.* liv. 945–50); Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 624 sqq.; Fleury, xxviii. xxxii. The signatures enable us to delimit the province of Milan at this date.

¹¹ *Ep.* xcix (*Op.* i. 1107–12; *P. L.* liv. 966–70); Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 628; Fleury, xxviii. xxxii.

¹² *Ep.* cii, § 5 (*Op.* i. 1140; *P. L.* liv. 988 A).

was in a position to inform Ravennius of Arles¹ and Rusticus of Narbonne² that all had gone well with his intervention at the Council of Chalcedon.

(ii) We have next to estimate the state of intelligence and piety in Gaul of the fifth century. Enough, for this purpose, to recall the part played by Marseilles and Lerins: they were the seats, not only of an ascetic and reforming zeal, but of learning equal to the task of protecting the Western Church from the excesses of her greatest doctor, Augustine. Prosper, also, of Aquitaine, for all his Augustinianism, should have his place in proof of the fertility, intellectual as well as spiritual, of the church in Gaul; and so, too, Salvian, 400–†80, of Cologne and Trèves. Both fled before the barbaric invaders to Marseilles, Prosper about 416, and Salvian perhaps ten years later; and both wrote, in answer to the taunts³ of a dying heathenism, to account for the calamities of a nominally⁴ Christian world. Augustine himself essayed the task from the standpoint of Christian philosophy,⁵ and encouraged Orosius to take it up as a Christian historian.⁶

§ 7. Prosper entered upon it as the Christian poet. In his *Carmen de Providentia Divina*,⁷ written shortly after his safe arrival at Marseilles, he tells us what his experience of the barbarian invasion had been. ‘If all the waters of the ocean’, he says, ‘had been spread over the fields of Aquitaine, they could not have wrought such injury as that which the ten years’ devastation by the Vandals and Goths had effected. The farms were cleared of their cattle and of the seed-corn stored in the barns, the farmsteads had been burnt with fire, vineyards and oliveyards had everywhere been destroyed, and behind the chariots and serried ranks of the warriors he had himself been compelled to march, the captive of war,

¹ *Ep.* cii (*Op.* i. 1136–40; *P. L.* liv. 983–6); Jaffé, No. 479; Fleury, xxviii. xxxii.

² *Ep.* ciii (*Op.* i. 1140–4; *P. L.* liv. 988–92); Jaffé, No. 480; Fleury, xxviii. xxxii.

³ For these taunts, and the ‘apologies’ they provoked; see Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Ambrose, in Bardenhewer, *Patrology*.

⁴ How ‘nominal’ Christianity became in the fourth century and has since remained, see C. Merivale, *The conversion of the northern nations*, 68–74, 174 sqq. (1866). He quotes Leo, *Sermo* xxvii, § 4 (*Op.* i. 94 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 218 sq.).

⁵ In the *De civitate Dei*.

⁶ In his *Historiae*.

⁷ *Op.* 785–82 (*P. L.* li. 617–38); some think it dubious (e. g. Dill, *Roman Society*, 137, n. 6). But he assigns it, in any case, to a native of southern Gaul who had seen the invasions of Vandal and Goth (see line 34), and wrote c. 415 (*ibid.* 316, n. 1).

covered with the dust of the road, driven out from the city which the Goths had burnt. Virgins vowed to God had been defiled; and Christian priests, regardless of their sacred office, had to suffer with the common people all the miseries of the invasion.¹ Yet,' writes Prosper, 'God exists and is good, and never fails to notice all that occurs, and He sends His judgement on the sins of men.'² He then proceeds to illustrate his theme from the Old Testament; and, contending that the calamities of Gaul were in punishment for its sins, recommends his fellow-countrymen to place themselves unreservedly and gladly in the hands of God and to accept whatever He shall be pleased to send. In his *Poema coniugis ad uxorem*³ he bids his wife join with him in taking advantage of their destitution to devote themselves with all the greater freedom to the service of God.⁴ Prosper was thus the poet of Christian resignation.

§ 8. Salvian,⁵ equally convinced of the justice of God and no less determined to proclaim it, wrote, a generation later, as the Christian prophet. In the spirit of righteous indignation he lays the blame upon the sins of Roman Christians. They had brought all these evils on the Empire. Salvian himself was born c. 400, near Cologne,⁶ and brought up at Trèves⁷—cities that were both sacked and burnt in his youth by the Ripuarian Franks. About 430, when Aetius had put down the Bagaudae,⁸ or peasant-insurgents maddened to revolution by the iniquities of Roman judges and the exactions of Roman tax-gatherers, and had also checked the Frankish raids, Salvian took refuge at Marseilles. He had married; but, after the birth of his daughter, Auspiciola, he and his wife, Palladia, resolved to live in continence: and Salvian was ordained to the priesthood, c. 424, spending some time in the monastery at Lerins. The fourth of his nine extant letters is from himself and his wife and daughter to justify their conduct to the parents of Palladia, who were Christians themselves but unable to appreciate these flights of zeal.⁹ About 480 Salvian is spoken of by

¹ *Carmen*, ll. 23–58.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 151 sq.

³ *Op.* 773–9 (*P. L.* li. 611–16); but its ascription to Prosper is doubtful, because it contains a taint of Pelagianism, *S. Dill*, 316, n. 2.

⁴ *Op.* 779 (*P. L.* 616 A).

⁵ Works in *P. L.* liii. 1–238 and *C. S. E. L.* viii: see also Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 181–94; Fleury, xxvi. xliii; C. Kingsley, *Roman and Teuton*, 28 sqq. (1875); Hodgkin, i. ii. 918–34; *Dill*, 137 sqq.; Holmes, 386 sqq.; Cooper-Marsdin, *Hist. of Lerins*, c. xv.

⁶ *Ep.* i, § 5 (*Op.* 184; *P. L.* liii. 158 c).

⁷ *De gub. Dei*, vi. xiii, § 72 (*Op.* 132; *P. L.* liii. 123 B).

⁸ *Ibid.* v. vi, §§ 24 sqq. (*Op.* 100; *P. L.* liii. 99 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 104 sq.

⁹ *Ep.* iv (*Op.* 187 sqq.; *P. L.* liii. 160 sqq.).

a contemporary cleric, Gennadius, as living at Marseilles, in hale old age.¹

Besides his letters, two works of his have come down to us. The first, written 435–9, bears the title *Adversus avaritiam*, or, in the MSS. *Ad ecclesiam*.² In it he addresses the churchmen of his day, under the pseudonym of Timothy³: which he explains, in the ninth of his letters, to his friend Salonius,⁴ a bishop, and son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons c. 435–†50. Father and son were trained at Lerins; and thus may have become known to Salvian. The writer then urges upon churchmen, by way of reparation for the crying sin of greed⁵ which refused His own to God, that is, to His Church and His poor, the duty of bestowing alms and gifts upon the Church, a duty that he holds to be particularly incumbent upon clerics. He insists especially upon making the Church one's heir by will⁶; and, if in this doctrine we are to detect one of the springs which fed clerical rapacity in later days,⁷ we must not forget that it was sound enough counsel when given: for public care of the poor was then confined to the Church, and never was there a time when pauperism assumed such alarming proportions.⁸

Salvian's second treatise is entitled *De praesenti iudicio*, or, in the MSS, *De gubernatione Dei*.⁹ It consists of eight books. Finished between 439 and 451, it is a theodicy; and, as such, invites comparison with the *De civitate Dei* of Augustine and the *Historiae* of Orosius. The problem of all three treatises is the same: they seek to justify the ways of God. 'Why,' it is asked, 'if this world be ordered by Divine Providence, is the framework of society, which is now no longer anti-Christian but Christian, going to pieces under the assaults of the barbarians?' So Dr. Hodgkin states the problem.¹⁰ The answer of Augustine was mainly negative; disaster, according to him, was an experience common enough when the gods of the heathen held sway. It cannot, therefore, be due to the Empire having renounced them, and gone over to the God of the

¹ *De vir. illustr.*, c. lxvii (P. L. lviii. 1099).

² *Op.* 206–96 (P. L. liii. 173–238).

³ *Adv. avaritiam*, I. i, § 1.

⁴ *Ep.* ix (*Op.* 199–205; P. L. liii. 169–74).

⁵ *Adv. avaritiam*, I. i, § 1. He contrasts with this love of money among Christians the ways of the primitive church (Acts iv. 32), § 5; and recalls the warning of Matt. vi. 21 in § 6.

⁶ *Ibid.* II. ix, § 41.

⁷ e. g. Chaucer, *The Somnour's Tale*, ll. 436–41.

⁸ *De gub. Dei*, v. viii, §§ 37 sqq. (*Op.* 104; P. L. liii. 102 B); Dill, 320.

⁹ *Op.* 1–182 (P. L. liii. 25–158); *C. S. E. L.* viii. 1–200. The §§ are given in the latter only.

¹⁰ *Italy, &c.*, I. ii. 919; cf. Dill, 64 sqq., 312 sqq.

Christians. Orosius carried the defence a stage further. Like his contemporary, the pagan Prefect of the City Rutilius Namatianus,¹ Orosius is hopeful; and gives ground for thinking that, in spite of severe shocks, Roman and Christian society is holding its own. But between the *Histories*, 417–19, of Orosius and the *Divine Government*, 439–51, of Salvian, a generation had passed; and meanwhile the ‘human deluge’, as Kingsley calls it,² had overwhelmed the West. The Visigoth reigned from Toulouse over Gaul and Spain; the Vandal over Africa from Carthage; while in Gaul, Roman and Goth held together in terror of the Huns. The ‘desperate optimism’³ of Orosius was therefore impossible to Salvian; the sum and substance of whose treatise is that ‘the vices of the Romans are the real cause of the downfall of their Empire’.⁴ ‘Salvian’, says Gibbon, making characteristic use of an opening to sneer, ‘has attempted to explain the moral government of the Deity; a task which may readily be performed by supposing that the calamities of the wicked are *judgments*, and those of the righteous *trials*.’⁵ In Book I, Salvian urges, in favour of God’s moral government, the opinion of philosophers who in old time held fast to this conviction.⁶ In Book II he turns to Holy Scripture, in order to establish on a yet stronger foundation the doctrine of a God who all along had cared for mankind, and in particular for His chosen people.⁷ In the remaining books he abandons method, and breaks loose into invective. The entire society of the Empire—Roman, Christian, and Catholic as it is, can only be truthfully described as ‘a sewer of iniquity’.⁸ The barbarians, pagan or heretic, are morally superior to the Romans; and, if it be pleaded that the sons of the Empire are Christians and Catholics,⁹ then this is but an aggravation of their guilt.¹⁰ The author exalts the virtues of the barbarians, by way of showing up the vices of the Gallo-

¹ Dill, 310–12. Rutilius holds that Rome’s services to mankind, in securing law and equal justice for all, are her security:

Quod regnas minus est quam quod regnare mereris.

² *Roman and Teuton*, 58.

³ Hodgkin, I. ii. 919.

⁴ *De gub. Dei*, VII. xxiii, § 108 (*Op.* 174; *P. L.* liii. 152 c). For the contrast between Orosius and Salvian (rather like that between Amos and Hosea), see Dill, 313–20.

⁵ Gibbon, c. xxxv, n. 12 (iii. 451).

⁶ *De gub. Dei*, I. i, § 1. For pagan ridicule of the Christian doctrine of a ‘curiosus Deus’ see Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, x, § 5 (*P. L.* iii. 276 A), and W. Bright, *Aspects of primitive church life*, 170, n. 1.

⁷ *De gub. Dei*, II. iii, §§ 13, 14 (*Op.* 33 sq.; *P. L.* liii. 52).

⁸ *Ibid.* III. ix, § 44 (*Op.* 54; *P. L.* liii. 66 A).

⁹ *Ibid.* v. iii, § 13 (*Op.* 96; *P. L.* liii. 97).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* III. xi, § 60 (*Op.* 59; *P. L.* liii. 70 B).

Romans, specially in Aquitaine.¹ He admits that the invaders have their vices²; but they are either pagans (like the Saxons, Franks, Gepids, Huns, Alamans, Alans) or heretics (like the Goths and Vandals), whereas we are Christians: and again, they are not wholly bad as are we Romans who 'have the Scriptures in our hands, and uncorrupted Scriptures too—not like theirs'.³ Anyway, fierce as are Goths and Vandals towards us, 'they are just and fair in their dealings one with another. Men of the same class, and following the same king, love one another with a true affection.'⁴ The impurities of the theatre, which we have renounced at our baptism,⁵ are unknown among them.⁶ Many of their tribes are free from the taint of drunkenness; and among all, except the Alans and the Huns, chastity is the rule.'⁷

Here Salvian writes as a man of letters: and as Tacitus, in the *Germania*, wrote up Teutonic freedom to render odious the tyranny of Domitian; or as Rousseau, †1778, in order to vilify the artificial society of the Ancien Régime, invested 'the noble savage' with all the virtues⁸; so Salvian avails himself of the same literary device, and exalts the Teuton to shame the Latin. He also writes as an ascetic and as a prophet; and, as such, is righteously indignant with the sins of God's people. He may have pictured them as worse than they were. As an historian, therefore, Salvian 'the preacher'⁹ must not be taken quite at face value; and fortunately we are in a position to check his arraignment by the evidence of Gallo-Romans who wrote two generations before him and a generation after him. There is no evidence of widespread corruption¹⁰ to be found in Ausonius,¹¹ 310–†88, nor in Sidonius Apollinaris, 431–†84, both Gallo-Romans, Christians, and men of letters; both, too, Praetorian Prefects, the one the tutor, and the other the father-in-law, of a Roman Emperor. We must, then, qualify the

¹ It was 'medulla fere omnium Galliarum', *ibid.* vii. ii, § 8 (*Op.* 143; *P. L.* liii. 151 A), pre-eminent as in wealth so in wickedness, *ibid.* vii. ii, § 12, iii, iv, §§ 13–20 (*Op.* i. 144–7; *P. L.* liii. 152 sq.).

² *Ibid.* iv. xiv, § 67 (*Op.* 82; *P. L.* liii. 86 sq.).

³ *Ibid.* v. ii, §§ 5–11 (*Op.* 93 sqq.; *P. L.* liii. 94 sqq.).

⁴ *Ibid.* v. iv, § 15 (*Op.* 97; *P. L.* liii. 97 B).

⁵ *Ibid.* vi. vi, § 31 (*Op.* 121; *P. L.* liii. 114 B), and Document No. 211.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 7 (*Op.* 122; *P. L.* liii. 115 B).

⁷ Hodgkin, i. ii. 920 sq., founded on *ibid.* iv. xiv, § 67, vii. xv, § 64 (*Op.* 82, 160; *P. L.* liii. 86 sq., 142 c).

⁸ On the upgrowth and the consequences of the theory that 'man is naturally good', see Sir T. Raleigh, *Elementary Politics*, 26 sq.

⁹ Dill, 142.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 140–2.

¹¹ T. R. Glover, *Life and letters in the fourth century*. c. v.

credit we attach to some of the assertions of Salvian ; but, for all that, he remains ' one of our most valuable sources of information as to the inner life of the dying Empire and the moral character of its foes '.¹ On one point, at any rate, Salvian spoke from experience : the abuses and unjust exactions practised by Gallic officials² would certainly come within his knowledge. With nothing is he so indignant as with the taxation of the poor and the exemption of the rich³ ; an evil which made the fiscal system of the Empire so oppressive, and contributed so much, centuries afterwards, to the French Revolution. ' Where,' he exclaims, ' or among whom is such an evil to be found but among the Romans in Gaul ? The Franks know not such. The Huns are innocent of such evil. You cannot find such among the Vandals and the Goths.'⁴ And on other points Salvian may be taken without misgiving : on the passion for amusement, so crazy that, while the churches stood empty, the circus was crowded with sightseers⁵ ; on the love of pleasure—' not to be found in Mayence, for it is in ruins ; nor in Cologne for it is chokeful of barbarians ; nor in that most excellent city of Trèves, for it has been laid low four times over.'⁶ Yet the few nobles that survive there are actually demanding of the Emperor the restoration of the games of the amphitheatre, as if that were the best remedy for a ruined town⁷ ; on the habit of profane swearing,⁸ so common with the Gallic provincials—a habit for which Chrysostom, it will be remembered, had to reprove the frivolous Antiochenes ; on the cruel treatment of slaves⁹ ; on the miseries of the poor ; and on the all-pervading spirit of injustice.¹⁰ From the Praetorian Prefect downwards, every class was out for plunder.¹¹ But Salvian's picture of Trèves¹² and Carthage¹³ at their fall is the climax of his indictment. They were the capitals, respectively, of Gaul and Africa ; and of both cities he appears to have had personal knowledge. Both alike were devoted to heart-

¹ Hodgkin, i. ii. 918.

² Dill, 320.

³ *De gub. Dei*, iv. vi, § 30, v. iv, § 17 (*Op.* 69, 98 ; *P. L.* liii. 77 B, 98).

⁴ *Ibid.* v. viii, § 36 (*Op.* 103 sq. ; *P. L.* liii. 102 A).

⁵ *Ibid.* vi. vii, §§ 35-8 (*Op.* 122 sq. ; *P. L.* liii. 115 sq.), and Document No. 212.

⁶ *Ibid.* vi. viii, § 39 (*Op.* 123 ; *P. L.* liii. 116 sq.).

⁷ *Ibid.* vi. xv, § 85 (*Op.* 135 ; *P. L.* liii. 125 c, d).

⁸ *Ibid.* iv. xv, §§ 71-3 (*Op.* 83 sq. ; *P. L.* liii. 87 sq.).

⁹ *Ibid.* v. iii, §§ 13-19 (*Op.* 63-6 ; *P. L.* liii. 73-5).

¹⁰ *Ibid.* v. iv-viii, §§ 15-44 (*Op.* 97 sqq. ; *P. L.* liii. 97 sqq.).

¹¹ *Ibid.* iii. x, § 50, iv. iv, § 21 (*Op.* 56, 66 ; *P. L.* liii. 67 c, 75 B).

¹² *Ibid.* vi. xiii-xv, §§ 72-9 (*Op.* 132 sqq. ; *P. L.* liii. 123 sqq.).

¹³ *Ibid.* vii. xvi-xx, §§ 65-88 (*Op.* 160 sqq. ; *P. L.* liii. 142 sqq.).

lessness and immorality, to the amphitheatre and the theatre¹; while as for Carthage, every other house was a house of ill-fame² and sins against nature were of no account.³ We know that Salvian is speaking the truth here, for not only has Augustine left, in his *Confessions*, the same record against Carthage⁴; but, immediately upon its capture, Gaiseric and his Vandals set themselves at once to purify the city. They banished the men who made a trade of ministering to vice,⁵ and put down prostitution with a firm, but not a cruel, hand.⁶ So the vices of the Romans and, in particular, unclean living are the explanation of the ruin of the Empire⁷; and this ruin is proof beyond question, according to Salvian, that God still governs the world.

(iii) Quite a contrast meets us in the surroundings and the personality of his fellow-countryman and younger contemporary, Sidonius Apollinaris, 431–†480?, another authority for these times and, in particular, for the social conditions of Gaul.

§ 9. Caius Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius,⁸ to give him his full name,⁹ was born at Lyons, November 431, of one of the noblest families of Gaul.¹⁰ It was in the year of the Council of Ephesus, and at a time when the Goths were firmly established at Toulouse and the Vandals were devastating Africa. He lived to see his native country given over entirely to the barbarians; and the place of Romulus Augustulus,¹¹ 475–6, the last of the Western Emperors, taken by Odovacar as king of Italy. Beginning as

¹ For the degradation of the Roman stage the best evidence is to be found in the legislation on actors and actresses, *Cod. Theod.* xv. vii, summarized in Dill, 57 sq. There was a *Tribunus Voluptatum* at Carthage, as at Rome and Milan; and in 413 he was ordered to recall to their trade the actresses who had by 'imperial kindness' been previously released (*Cod. Theod.* xv. vii. 13, and Document No. 123). Their trade was hereditary, like many other trades, so there was no escape for them from a life of condemnation to vice.

² *De gub. Dei*, vii. xvii, § 72 (*Op.* 163; *P. L.* liii. 144 B). He goes on to say that chastity was to be found *only* among the clergy, *ibid.*, §§ 74–5 (*Op.* 163; *P. L.* liii. 144 sq.), and Document No. 213.

³ *Ibid.* vii. xviii, § 79 (*Op.* 165; *P. L.* liii. 146 A).

⁴ *Aug. Conf.* iii, § 1 (*Op.* i. 87 D; *P. L.* xxxii. 683).

⁵ *De gub. Dei*, vii. xxi, § 89 (*Op.* 168; *P. L.* liii. 148 c).

⁶ *Ibid.* vii. xxii, § 97 (*Op.* 170; *P. L.* liii. 149 sq.).

⁷ *Ibid.* vii. xiii, § 56 (*Op.* 157; *P. L.* liii. 140 c).

⁸ Works in *P. L.* lviii. 443–748; *Mon. Germ. Hist.* viii (Berolini, 1887); letters, tr. O. M. Dalton (Clar. Press, 1915): see also Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 195–284; F. Guizot, *Hist. Civ. in France*, c. iii (*Works*, i. 331 sqq.: ed. Bohn); Hodgkin, ii. 297 sqq.; Dill, 187 sqq.; Holmes, 409 sqq.; Bardenhewer, 606 sq.; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 603 sqq.; C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches*, 57 sqq.

⁹ *Carmen*, ix. *ad init.* (*Op.* 351; *P. L.* lviii. 694 c).

¹⁰ *Ep.* i. iii (*Op.* 7; *P. L.* lviii. 450 B).

¹¹ Hodgkin, ii. 497.

scholar and magistrate, he ended as bishop. Thus he unites the old world that was passing away with the new world then rising to take its place.

His great-grandfather had stood high in the Imperial service. His grandfather, the first Christian of the family,¹ became Praetorian Prefect of Gaul under the British usurper Constantine,² while his father held the same office,³ 448–9, under Valentinian III.⁴ He was educated at Lyons⁵ where, as in the other Universities of Gaul, the classic and pagan tradition still held the field⁶ to the exclusion of Christian culture; and here he formed friendships with other young men of distinction who afterwards figure among his correspondents.⁷ Poetry, letter-writing, and a literary immortality was their common aim. At the age of twenty he married Papianilla, the only daughter of Avitus, 395–†456; and thus became possessed of Avitacum, an estate and mansion in Auvergne, which she brought with her as her dowry.⁸ Sidonius speaks of her with affection, as ‘a good wife’⁹; and they had a son, Apollinaris, and two daughters, Severiana and Roscia. Her father was a brave, capable, and honest man.¹⁰ He too was Prefect of Gaul, 439–45; and by his persuasion it was that Theodoric I, king of the Visigoths, joined forces with the Roman General, Aetius, in the battle of Châlons, 451, when Attila was driven out of Gaul. Attila died two years later,¹¹ and the break up of his kingdom¹² led to a temporary revival of Roman life in Gaul. There were Councils at Angers,¹³ 455, Tours,¹⁴ 461, and Vannes,¹⁵ 461–5; and at Angers the Church took courage to enact penalties against the betrayers of cities¹⁶—perhaps to the Huns. A transference of the Empire, and no mere recovery, followed upon the murder of Aetius, 454, and its sequel the assassination of Valentinian III, in 455. For the Emperor’s death brought to an end the dynasty of Theodosius¹⁷;

¹ *Ep.* III. xii (*Op.* 78; *P. L.* lviii. 504 B).

² *Ep.* v. ix (*Op.* 138 sq.; *P. L.* lviii. 540 sq.).

³ *Ep.* VIII. vi (*Op.* 219; *P. L.* lviii. 594 c).

⁴ *Ep.* v. ix (*Op.* 139; *P. L.* lviii. 541 A).

⁵ In rhetoric and poetry (*Carmen*, ix. 313 [*Op.* 361; *P. L.* lviii. 703 B]), and in philosophy (*Ep.* iv. i, § 3 [*Op.* 85; *P. L.* lviii. 508 B]).

⁶ Holmes, 410.

⁷ e. g. Avitus the younger, *Ep.* III. i, § 1 (*Op.* 61; *P. L.* lviii. 493 c).

⁸ For a description of it, see *Ep.* II. ii (*Op.* 34 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 473 sqq.); and *Carmen*, xviii (*Op.* 386; *P. L.* lviii. 723 sq.).

⁹ *Ep.* v. xvi, § 3 (*Op.* 147; *P. L.* lviii. 546 B).

¹⁰ Hodgkin, ii. 375 sqq.

¹¹ Hodgkin, ii. 171.

¹² *Ibid.* ii. 190 sqq.

¹³ Mansi, vii. 899 sqq.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* vii. 943 sqq.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* vii. 951 sqq.

¹⁶ Canon iv; Mansi, vii. 901 B.

¹⁷ Hodgkin, ii. 190 sqq.

while Gaiseric's capture of the city, by which his death was avenged, might seem to put the claims of Rome, for the time, under eclipse. Her authority passed over into Gaul; for Theodoric put forward Avitus as Emperor,¹ 455-†6. With a genuine desire to heal the sorrows of his country, Avitus made the journey to Rome, for recognition. He was accompanied by his son-in-law, Sidonius; who thus found introduction, at an early age, to the society of the capital. Thrice he delivered a panegyric on an Emperor: at Rome, 455, on his father-in-law, Avitus²; at Lyons, 458, on Majorian,³ 457-†61, his rival set up by the Suevic adventurer, Ricimer, who was now master of Italy and, for sixteen years, 456-†72, after the death of Avitus, virtually supreme; and again at Rome, 467, on Anthemius,⁴ 467-†72, the client of the Byzantine Court. Such functions betokened the reputation of Sidonius as poet and man of letters. For the first, he was awarded a statue in the Forum of Trajan.⁵ For the second, he was pardoned his connexion with the defeated party of Avitus and restored to the favour⁶ of Majorian and his patron. For the third, he was promoted Prefect of the City,⁷ 468. In the intervals of these oratorical triumphs, Sidonius returned to enjoy, at Avitacum, the dignified ease of a country gentleman. Then, all of a sudden, he was wanted to be a bishop. At this time, bishops in Gaul were apt to be either monks, or men of good birth and handsome fortune.⁸ If the first advanced the Christian ideal, the second were in a position to protect the interests of Christians. No sooner then had Sidonius attained the highest civil honours,⁹ than his neighbours demanded him for their spiritual father; and in 469-70 he was elected¹⁰ bishop of the Urbs Arverna, now Clermont-Ferrand. His literary career is divided by this event. Hitherto, he had devoted himself to poetry; and, as the hexameter and the elegiac still remained pagan, while other metres, and prose as a whole, had become entirely Christian,¹¹ Sidonius wrote,

¹ Hodgkin, ii. 374 sqq.

² *Carmen*, vii (*Op.* 330 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 678 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 386 sqq.

³ *Carmen*, v (*Op.* 308 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 659 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 396 sqq.

⁴ *Carmen*, ii (*Op.* 288 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 640 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii. 458 sqq. Of his journey to Rome, Sidonius has left an account, including a description of Ravenna, in *Ep.* i. v (*Op.* 9 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 452 sqq.), quoted in Hodgkin, i. 859, Document No. 231.

⁵ *Ep.* ix. xvi, § 3 (*Op.* 284; *P. L.* lviii. 638 A). ⁶ Hodgkin, ii. 414.

⁷ *Ep.* i. ix, § 6 (*Op.* 23; *P. L.* lviii. 484 B). ⁸ Holmes, 409; Dill, 215.

⁹ He was, as Prefect of the City, the third personage in the Empire, only the Emperor and the Patrician, Ricimer, ranking before him, Hodgkin, ii. 460.

¹⁰ *Ep.* vii. ix, § 14 (*Op.* 193; *P. L.* lviii. 578 A); Holmes, 426.

¹¹ C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches*, 60.

in the versification of Virgil and Ovid, poems still pagan in form and secular in subject. Such versifying, however, he thought incompatible with the new character of bishop. Henceforward, he turned to the composition of letters ; to make a name for himself with posterity¹ and not simply to be read by his correspondents ; and in the style of Symmachus and Pliny.² The vanity of authorship, however, did not prevent him from taking seriously the duties of the episcopate. On taking up the burden, he asks neighbouring bishops for their prayers.³ He urged his brother-in-law, Ecdicius, to come and protect Clermont, 474, from the Visigoths.⁴ He summoned his friend Constantius, a priest of Lyons, to preach a mission to its citizens.⁵ In the spring of 475 he wrote to Mamertus, archbishop of Vienne 463-†75, to tell him that he was introducing at Clermont the Rogation Processions⁶ which the archbishop had established in his own city.⁷ He tried, but in vain, to save Auvergne from being ceded, 475, to the Gothic king, Euric, 466-†85, in order to secure the retention for the Empire of Arles and Provence.⁸ He sustained a brief exile,⁹ at the hand of Euric, as punishment for his loyalty to the Gallo-Roman cause. He may have lived to see the cession of Provence, 480, as well, into Visigothic hands. At any rate, he discharged his office zealously, for he enjoyed the friendship of Patiens, archbishop of Lyons¹⁰ 451-†91, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes¹¹ 433-†79 ; and he earned a place, with Martin, the two Hilaries, and his friend St. Remigius,¹² 437-†533, who baptized Clovis the first Christian king of France, among the saints of Gaul.¹³

§ 10. Sidonius is almost our only authority for the political history of his time. He was kinsman or panegyrist of one puppet-emperor after another, as well as an high official. So he had political information at command. But of more permanent interest is the evidence he supplies for the social conditions of his

¹ *Ep.* viii. ii, § 3 (*Op.* 214 ; *P. L.* lviii. 590 c).

² *Ep.* ix. i, § 1 (*Op.* 249 ; *P. L.* lviii. 615 A) ; Dill, 188, n. 6.

³ Holmes, 426.

⁴ *Ep.* iii. iii (*Op.* 65 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 497).

⁵ *Ep.* iii. ii (*Op.* 63 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 495 sqq.).

⁶ *Ep.* vii. i, § 2 (*Op.* 172 ; *P. L.* lviii. 563 B).

⁷ *Ep.* v. xiv, § 2 (*Op.* 144 ; *P. L.* lviii. 544 c).

⁸ *Ep.* vii. vi, vii (*Op.* 181 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 569 sqq.) ; Hodgkin, ii. 491 sq.

⁹ *Ep.* viii. iii, § 1 (*Op.* 214 ; *P. L.* lviii. 591 A) ; Hodgkin, ii. 316 ; Holmes, 430.

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 97 sqq.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 126 sqq. For the episcopal friends of Sidonius see Holmes, 432, n. 1. These two may have been his consecrators.

¹² *Ep.* ix. vii (*Op.* 258 sq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 621 sq.) ; Holmes, 445.

¹³ Hodgkin, ii. 319.

day. Sidonius was a great aristocrat. He belonged to the class from which Patricians, like his brother-in-law, Ecdicius,¹ and many bishops, such as his friend Patiens, were drawn. They appear to have remained as well off² under Goths or Burgundians as under Roman rule. That rule had been oppressive to the classes below them, as we know from Salvian, supported by the Theodosian Code ; but of this Sidonius says nothing. He is only interested in his own class : held aloof and bound together, as it was, by distinction of birth, by companionship at the University, and by traditions of Imperial service. Sidonius describes with affection his country-seat at Avitacum³ ; and tells us of others where he was a welcome visitor—the Voroangus of his cousin, Apollinaris, and the adjoining Prusianum⁴ of his friend, Tonantius Ferreolus. When he arrived in the morning some of the guests were playing tennis ; the less active, dice ; others again were in the library, reading the classics or discussing the theology of Origen. *Déjeuner* followed at 11 a.m., a short, but plentiful meal⁵ ; and they sat over their wine, for a bit, afterwards. Then some went for a ride ; others, to bathe, for every mansion had its baths ; and there was a stately dinner⁶ in the evening. A literary atmosphere pervaded the homes of these Gallo-Roman grandees. You could not find admission to their society unless you were able to improvise a few verses, say, in praise of your bath-towel !⁷ The ladies had a share in this diletante routine, though a limited one. Papianilla was busier with her household than her husband with his estate ; but she and her friends were expected to encourage the literary ambition of their men-folk⁸ ; and if they were not all accomplished enough to share it, like Eulalia, the cousin of Sidonius, who read the classics,⁹ then there were shelves in the library, as at Prusianum, stocked with religious books for their especial benefit.¹⁰ In all this there is much

¹ He was made Patrician by the Emperor Nepos, 474-†5, *Ep.* v. xvi, § 1 (*Op.* 146 ; *P. L.* lviii. 546 A).

² Ecdicius fed 4,000 people in a famine : see Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 24 (*Script. rerum Merovingicarum*, i. i. 86 sqq.) ; Gibbon, c. xxxvi (iv. 39). Patiens did the like : Sidonius, *Ep.* vi. xii, § 5 (*Op.* 168 ; *P. L.* lviii. 561 A).

³ *Ep.* ii. ii (*ut sup.*) ; and its baths, *Carmen*, xviii (*ut sup.*).

⁴ *Ep.* ii. ix, §§ 1, 7 (*Op.* 47, 49 ; *P. L.* lviii. 483 A, 485 A) ; tr. Hodgkin, ii. 324 sqq., and Document No. 232.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 6 (*Op.* 49 ; *P. L.* lviii. 485 A) ; at ' quinta hora ', i. e. 11 a.m.

⁶ *Ibid.*, § 10 (*Op.* 50 ; *P. L.* lviii. 485 C).

⁷ *Ep.* v. xvii, § 10 (*Op.* 151 ; *P. L.* lviii. 549 A).

⁸ *Ep.* ii. x, §§ 5, 6 (*Op.* 54 ; *P. L.* lviii. 488 A, B).

⁹ *Carmen*, xxiv, ll. 95-8 (*Op.* 418 ; *P. L.* lviii. 748 B).

¹⁰ *Ep.* ii. ix, § 4 (*Op.* 48 ; *P. L.* lviii. 484 B).

elegant trifling ; but no trace of that looseness of morals, with which Salvian charges the whole social structure of the time. In one letter ¹ we have an unpleasant incident. Sidonius mentions the irregular connexion of a young noble with a slave-girl. He has nothing but loathing and contempt for the girl ; but the young man he treats with indulgence. His ' slip ' is entirely condoned, in the eyes of Sidonius (writing, by the way, as a bishop), by his having thrown her over in order to marry a lady of wealth and rank. He had, in fact, consulted the name and fortune of his family ; what more was wanted ? On the whole, the world of Sidonius was ' about as Christian in sentiment and conduct as our own ' ² ; and not vice but pride of class ³ and cultivated ease was its contribution to the decline of the Roman Empire.

§ 11. Sidonius, as bishop of Clermont-Ferrand, 470-†80?, belongs to another world. The bishop, it is true, had sometimes to give good dinners to barbarian princes ⁴ ; though the picture of Theodore II, as drawn by Sidonius, ⁵ represents the royal table as refined enough. He had also to manage the estates of his church. But, if prelate, he was pastor as well. He lived in the chief town of his diocese, where he received all comers ; composed their differences ; maintained intimate relations with the municipal authorities ; and, apart from his leadership in worship, was the chief personage in the city. ⁶ Yet this was to be in close touch with the people—not aloof from them, like the great noble living on his country estate. For such a post of influence there was not unnaturally, as at Châlons ⁷ or Bourges, ⁸ a good deal of intrigue at a vacancy. Patiens presided at the election of a bishop, in the one case ; Sidonius himself, in the other. Each took the only remedy, by brushing aside all the rival candidates and appointing his own—in the one case, the archdeacon, a modest man of blameless character ; and in the other, a soldier of rank and wealth. But more pleasing im-

¹ *Ep.* ix. vi (*Op.* 257 sq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 620 sq.). ² Dill, 210.

³ But there were good men among this class, e. g. Vectius, *Ep.* iv. ix (*Op.* 98 sq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 513 sq.) ; tr. Hodgkin, ii. 340 sqq. ' His character ', says Dill (p. 213), ' might have been drawn by the author of the *Serious Call.*'

⁴ As Patiens, archbishop of Lyons, to his neighbour the king of the Burgundians, *Ep.* vi. xii, § 3 (*Op.* 168 ; *P. L.* lviii. 560 c).

⁵ *Ep.* i. ii (*Op.* 2 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 445 sqq.) ; tr. Hodgkin, ii. 352 sqq.

⁶ For the duties imposed upon bishops in his day see Sidonius, *Epp.* vi. ii, iv, ix, x (*Op.* 153 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 552 sqq.).

⁷ *Ep.* v. xxv (*Op.* 125 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 531 sqq.).

⁸ *Ep.* vii. ix (*Op.* 188 sqq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 575 sqq.).

pressions of the church-life of the day are to be found in Sidonius. There is the feast of St. Just at Lyons, which he attended as a layman. It began with a Procession and Vigil before daylight; the psalms being sung antiphonally by two choirs, one of monks and one of clergy. The church was crowded, for the whole population was there, each order in its proper place; and it felt very stuffy. So Sidonius was glad to get out into the open air, with his friends, where they occupied themselves some with tennis (when one of them got so hot as to call for a bath-towel, whence the epigram), others with backgammon, till it was 9 a.m., and so time for Terce and the celebration of the Eucharist. All were still fasting; and, after Mass, they went home for *prandium* at 11 a.m., and took their *siesta* at noon,¹ or the sixth hour, from which that daily episode derives its name. Other impressions of the pages of Sidonius recall the princely charity of archbishop Patiens²; the oratory of St. Remigius,³ the apostle of the Franks; the scholarly tastes⁴ and the sanctity of Lupus, bishop of Troyes; the liturgical innovations of Mamertus, archbishop of Vienne; above all, the ascetic fervour to be seen at Lerins,⁵ or in the Jura,⁶ or in Auvergne itself, where Abraham, a solitary from the East, had settled.⁷ It was natural enough that Sidonius, as bishop, should have bishops among his friends; not so likely, perhaps, that he should have been on equally intimate terms with the 'religious' of Gaul. But he had a genius for friendship; for which we may pardon his harmless vanity. He thought himself the last representative of the old Roman culture.⁸ He found himself just as much at home with those who were making the far grander traditions of the Catholic Church.

II

§ 12. From Gaul we pass into Spain, where, since they crossed the Pyrenees on Michaelmas Eve, 409,⁹ the Sueves held the greater

¹ *Ep.* v. xvii (*Op.* 148; *P. L.* lviii. 547 sqq.); tr. Hodgkin, ii. 321 sqq., and Document No. 233.

² In church-building, *Ep.* ii. x (*Op.* 51; *P. L.* lviii. 486 sqq.), vi. xii, § 4 (*Op.* 168; *P. L.* lviii. 560 c) as well as in the relief of distress, *Ep.* vi. xii, § 5 (*Op.* 168; *P. L.* lviii. 561 A).

³ *Ep.* ix. vii (*Op.* 258 sq.; *P. L.* lviii. 621 sq.).

⁴ *Ep.* viii. xi, § 2 (*Op.* 232; *P. L.* lviii. 604 A).

⁵ *Carmen*, xvi. 104 sqq. (*Op.* 384; *P. L.* lviii. 720 sq.).

⁶ *Ep.* iv. xxv, § 5 (*Op.* 126; *P. L.* lviii. 332 B). For the monasteries in the Jura, e. g. St. Claud, see Chaix, *Apoll. Sid.* ii. 218.

⁷ *Ep.* vii. xvii (*Op.* 207; *P. L.* lviii. 586 sq.).

⁸ *Ep.* ii. x, § 5 (*Op.* 51; *P. L.* lviii. 486 B).

⁹ Hodgkin, i. ii. 824.

part of Southern and Western Spain, and ruled it from their capital, Astorga,¹ till their kingdom was shattered by the Visigoths, 5 October 456, under Theodoric II.² The Suevic kings, Hermanric,³ 409–41, and Rechila, 441–†8, were pagans; but Rechiar, 448–†57, became a Christian and a Catholic. So long, then as the dynasty continued heathen, the Priscillianists, of whose origin and progress an account has already been given, had nothing to fear from the orthodox episcopate. Its disciplinary powers, indeed, had been increased by Imperial edicts of 409–10; but, with the invasion of the Sueves, these edicts ceased to operate. Symposius, bishop of Astorga c. 380–400, and metropolitan of Gallaecia, had rallied to the orthodox, though a minority of his suffragans held out. The minority proved tenacious; and a successor of his, Turibius, c. 444, became alarmed. Some Priscillianists were cited to his court⁴; and Turibius addressed to Idacius and Ceponius, two of his suffragans, an account⁵ of their tenets and specially of their use of apocryphal books.⁶ Turibius and Idacius together invoked the aid of Antony, bishop of Merida 445–8, and metropolitan of Lusitania; for at Merida the Suevic Court, at present, resided; and Antony, it was hoped, might exert some influence with the Catholic king, Rechiar. Turibius also invoked the aid of Pope Leo. He reported to him in a letter the sad state of the churches in Gallaecia; and sent a minute of Priscillianism, in sixteen propositions, with a *libellus* of his own in refutation.⁷ The Pope replied in *Quam laudabiliter*⁸ of 21 July 447. ‘Time was’, he said, with reference to the execution of Priscillian sixty years before, ‘when the Church was assisted by the laws of Christian princes. The fear of corporal punishment makes men betake themselves to the spiritual remedy. But, now-a-days, the invasions of our enemies have prevented the laws from being executed; and the difficulty of travelling has rendered Councils rare.⁹ This is the chance for heresy.’ The Pope then replies to the sixteen articles *seriatim*. He prohibits the Priscillianist *apocrypha*,¹⁰ as well as the writings of their champion Dictinius.¹¹ He notices the similarity between

¹ Hodgkin, II. 380.² Ibid. II. 389.³ Ibid. II. 224.⁴ Idatius, *Chron.* ad ann. xxi, Val. III (*P. L.* li. 882 A).⁵ Printed in Leo, *Op.* 711 sqq. (*P. L.* liv. 693 sqq.); and tr. Fleury, xxvii. ix.⁶ Turibii, *Ep.*, § 5 (*Op.* 713 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 694 c).⁷ Leo, *Ep.* xv, § 1 (*Op.* 695; *P. L.* liv. 678 sq.).⁸ *Ep.* xv (*Op.* 694–711; *P. L.* liv. 678–92); Jaffé, No. 412; Fleury, xxvii. x, and Document No. 228.⁹ Ibid. (*Op.* 696; *P. L.* liv. 679 sq.).¹⁰ Ibid., § 15.¹¹ Ibid., § 16.

the tenets of Priscillianists and those of the Manichees¹ whom he had just condemned at Rome, as Turibius will see by the minutes of his synod enclosed. The best remedy for the troubles of Spain would be a synod too, if possible, of the four provinces of Tarragona, Cartagena, Lusitania, and Gallaecia; failing this 'general Council', of Gallaecia at least.² But even this turned out to be impossible; and all that could be done was to collect signatures. Turibius procured the preparation by a Gallaecian bishop, named Pastor, of an orthodox formulary entitled *Regulae fidei . . . contra Priscillianos*³ or *Libellus in modum symboli*⁴; and circulated it, together with a letter from the Pope, to all the bishops of Spain. They appended their signatures—a few from Gallaecia with reservations.⁵ It was a blow for the revival of Priscillianism; and, if the Pope had to be called in to deliver it, that was, in part, because synodical action of the local church was disorganized by the barbarian conquests. A parallel case is Prosper's request for the intervention of the Pope, to deal with the semi-Pelagians; for, owing to the Vandal conquest of Africa, the synods of that country which had sufficed to cope with Pelagianism could render him no assistance. The papacy therefore profited by the barbarian invasions. If it rose by the fall of the Western Empire, it rose, too, by the collapse of Conciliar Government in Africa and in Spain. In Spain, Priscillianism disappeared; but a subtler heresy took its place. In spite of the Catholicism of Rechiar, his subjects became infected with the Arianism of their neighbours and rivals the Visigoths: till at last, after Leovigild, king of the Visigoths 572–†86, had absorbed the Suevic kingdom, 584,⁶ Spain as a whole became Catholic under his successor, Reccared, 588–†601, at the Third Council of Toledo,⁷ 589. In repudiating Arianism it added the *Filioque* to the Oecumenical Creed.

III

From Spain we pass over into Africa, where the Vandal invasion, 429, and capture of Carthage, 439, already described, call for a brief estimate of the Vandal persecution and its effects.⁸

¹ Leo, *Ep.* xv, § 16. ² *Ibid.*, § 17 (*Op.* 710 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 692 A, B).

³ Mansi, iii. 1002 c–1004 c.

⁴ Gennadius, *De script. eccl.* lxxvi (*P. L.* lviii. 1103 A).

⁵ Idatius, *Chron.* ad ann. xxiii, Val. III (*P. L.* li. 882 B).

⁶ Hodgkin, ii. 389, n. 1.

⁷ Mansi, ix. 977 sqq.; Hefele, iv. 416 sqq.; Gibbon, xxxvii (iii. 93 sq.); J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 502.

⁸ Fleury, xxviii. lvii–lix; Gibbon, c. xxxvii (iii. 81 sqq.); Hodgkin, ii.

§ 13. Our knowledge of it comes from Augustine and his biographer, but specially from an all-but-contemporary authority, Victor, bishop of Vita, in the province of Byzacena, who wrote his *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* ¹ about 486. The work is divided into five books. In the first of these Victor tells of the persecution under Gaiseric from the invasion of Africa, 429, to his death in 477. The second, fourth, and fifth deal with the persecution under his son and successor, Huneric, 477–†84; while the third contains the confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius, archbishop of Carthage 479–†505, and presented to Huneric at the Conference of Carthage, ² 1 February 484. We are therefore concerned only with the contents of Book I.

In the year of the invasion, 429, Augustine was plied with questions by Honoratus, bishop of Thiava, as to the duty of bishops at such a time. Augustine ³ urged them to remain with their flocks, and share their miseries: except where one particular pastor is marked out for attack, in which case he may take to flight. Possidius, his biographer, has left us a description of the sorrows Augustine lived to see: cities reduced to ruin, churches bereft of clergy, Religious dispersed, worship driven into hiding. Fruitful as Africa was in churches, not above three—those of Cirta (Constantine), Hippo, and Carthage—survived the common ruin. ⁴ We do not know when Cirta fell; but Hippo was ceded, with the rest of Numidia, most of Proconsular Africa, and all of Byzacena, by the treaty of 11 February 435. ⁵ Between this session and the fall of Carthage, ⁶ 19 October 439, Gaiseric, feeling himself strong enough for the task, set about the reduction of his Catholic subjects to the creed of Arius. It might have been expected that the Donatists, so long the victims of a Catholic government, would have seized the opportunity to take a hand with the conqueror against their former oppressors. They appear to have found sufficient satis-

265 sqq.; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 625 sqq.; H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, ii. 143 sqq.

¹ *P. L.* lviii. 179–260; *C. S. E. L.* vii; Bardenhewer, 614 sqq.

² Note the list of the Catholic episcopate summoned to this Conference, with marginal notes, written in 486, as to what became of them in the persecution, e. g. 'peribat', &c. They were 466 in all. See it in *C. S. E. L.* vii. 117–34, and cf. Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 645, n. 1.

³ *Ep.* ccxxviii (*Op.* ii. 830–5; *P. L.* xxxiii. 1013 sqq.); translated in Newman, *Ch. F.*, c. xi, and Document No. 190.

⁴ Possidius, *Vita*, xxviii (*Op.* x, app. 277–8; *P. L.* xxxii. 57 sqq.); Fleury, xxv. xxv.

⁵ Hodgkin, ii. 248 sq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 250.

faction in looking on, while the Vandals avenged them. Gaiseric, in 437, began by striking at bishops ; for Possidius and others were sent into exile.¹ Arcadius, a Spaniard in the royal household, confessed himself a Catholic and perished with his companions. They were encouraged to stand firm by a letter, still extant, from Antonius Honoratus,² bishop of Cirta, which is worthy to rank with the exhortations to martyrdom of Tertullian³ and Origen.⁴ On the capture of Carthage, Gaiseric banished the archbishop, Quovultdeus, 437-†54, and many of the clergy of the city (of whom there were as many as five hundred⁵ in the following reign). They were compelled to embark on unseaworthy ships, but reached Naples in safety.⁶ As of clergy, so of churches, there was a considerable number in Carthage⁷ ; among them the *Basilica Maiorum*⁸ where reposed the relics of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, martyred 7 March 203 ; and, outside the walls, the two Basilicas of St. Cyprian ; marking, the one the site of his martyrdom,⁹ 14 September 258, and the other the place of his burial. All the churches within the walls, and some beyond, were taken from the Catholics and handed over to the Arians¹⁰ ; but this was only to treat the Catholics as they themselves had treated the Arian minority at Milan in the time of St. Ambrose or at Constantinople under St. Chrysostom. Catholic funerals were to be conducted in silence ; and, in answer to a petition of Catholics to be left in peace, Gaiseric replied, ‘ I have resolved to let none of your race and name escape ’.¹¹ But he does not seem to have carried out his threat. He left matters to the Arian prelates of his court ; and, once more, the result of persecution, according to Victor, was a revival of religion among the Catholics of Carthage.¹² It is possible that the revival may have owed something to the purging of the city from vice which the Vandals themselves effected. But a revival there was ; and it was assisted by one of the last acts of Valentinian III.

¹ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. (*Op.* 746 ; *P. L.* li. 597 B).

² *P. L.* l. 567-70.

³ *Ad martyras* [A. D. 197] (*Op.* i. 3-14 : ed. F. Oehler).

⁴ *Exhortatio ad martyrium* [A. D. 235-8] (*Op.* ii. 274-310 ; *P. L.* xi. 564-637).

⁵ Victor Vit. v, c. 9 (*Op.* 41 ; *P. L.* lviii. 246 c) ; Leclercq, ii. 156, n. 3.

⁶ Victor Vit. i, c. 5 (*Op.* 5 ; *P. L.* lviii. 187 B).

⁷ On the churches of Carthage, see Leclercq, ii. 157, n. 2 ; and s.v. ‘ Carthage ’, in F. Cabrol, *Dict. d’Arch. chr.* ii. 2190-2330.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 13.

⁹ *Ibid.*, § 15.

¹⁰ Victor Vit. i, c. 5 (*Op.* 5 ; *P. L.* lviii. 187 c).

¹¹ *Ibid.* ¹² *Ibid.* i, c. 7 (*Op.* 7 ; *P. L.* lviii. 191 A).

At his intervention Gaiseric permitted the election, once more, of an archbishop of Carthage. Deogratias succeeded, 454–†77. He signalized the new religious life of his church by his charity to the captives who had been carried off from Rome by Gaiseric on his capture of the City, 455 ; for he sold the sacred vessels, ransomed the prisoners, and took care of the sick and destitute in the *Basilica Fausti* and the *Basilica Novarum*.¹ Thomas, his successor, c. 458, was massacred by Arians² about the time when Majorian, 457–†61, was threatening an invasion of Africa³ ; and the persecution broke out afresh. It always had an *arrière-pensée* of a political character. The Catholic religion was that of the Roman Empire, and with the Empire the Vandals were at war. Gaiseric forbade the appointment of bishops to sees that fell vacant in Proconsular Africa⁴ ; and, as his territory now included the coast from Tripoli to the straits of Gibraltar,⁵ there was a wider field for oppression than, in 435–442, between the first and the second treaty with Valentinian III. In Mauretania, for instance, which had been more or less exempt from 442–55, and administered by Pope Leo⁶ in default of synodical action on the spot, there were exiled confessors ; they had commenced missionary work, and sent to Rome for a bishop to continue it.⁷ In ‘Africa’ proper there was an attack on Catholic worship ; sacred vessels and books had to be surrendered, while altar-cloths were cut up to make shirts and breeches ; a bishop, Valerian of Abbenza, who was eighty years of age and had resisted, was chased from his city and left to perish without food or shelter.⁸ At Easter, an Arian priest, named Auduit, led an assault on a Catholic congregation at Regia, in which the Reader was shot in the throat by an arrow, as he stood in the pulpit to chant the Alleluia.⁹ In 475 the king ‘closed the Church of Carthage’ ; but, next year, with a view to peace with the Emperor Zeno, 474–†91, then being negotiated by his envoy, the

¹ Victor Vit. i, c. 8 (*Op.* 7 ; *P. L.* lviii. 191 sq.) ; Gibbon, c. xxxvi (iii. 7), and Document No. 237.

² Ibid, c. 9 (*Op.* 7 ; *P. L.* lviii. 192 sq.).

³ Procopius, *De bello Vandalico*, i, § 7 (*Op.* i. 340 sq. ; Teubner, 1905) ; Hodgkin, ii. 425–9.

⁴ Victor Vit. i, c. 9 (*Op.* 7 sq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 192 A).

⁵ Ibid. i, c. 4 (*Op.* 5 ; *P. L.* lviii. 186 B).

⁶ See *Cum de ordinationibus* of 10 Aug. 446 ; Leo, *Ep.* xii (*Op.* i. 657 sqq. ; *P. L.* liv. 645 sqq.) ; Jaffé, No. 410.

⁷ Victor Vit. i, c. 11 (*Op.* 9 ; *P. L.* lviii. 195 sq.).

⁸ Ibid., c. 12 (*Op.* 9 sq. ; *P. L.* lviii. 196 sq.).

⁹ Ibid., c. 13 (*Op.* 10 ; *P. L.* lviii. 107 B).

Patrician Severus, Gaiseric restored to the Church her liberty, and recalled the clergy from exile.¹ It was the year of the disappearance of the Western Empire, with Romulus Augustulus,² 475–6; and the barbarian lived to see it and rejoice. But he died the following year³; and the persecution, though it slept for a period during which Eugenius became archbishop of Carthage, 481–†505,⁴ was renewed under pressure of the Arian episcopate by the edict,⁵ 25 February 484, of Huneric, 477–†84, his son. Huneric was a bitter Arian; he persecuted for religious ends; and died of the dreadful disease⁶ which carried off other persecutors—Antiochus Epiphanes,⁷ Herod Agrippa I,⁸ Galerius,⁹ and Philip II of Spain. But Gaiseric's persecution was political.

On the whole, the indictment of Victor of Vita against the Vandals under Gaiseric comes to this:—(1) Catholic churches, as a rule, were handed over to Arian worship, or else destroyed; and it is the desecration or destruction of sacred buildings that, more than anything else, has branded the name of Vandalism to all time as a synonym for senseless destructiveness. (2) The springs of the life of the Church were dried up when, as under Diocletian, her sacred books were seized, and, as under Valerian, her worship put down. (3) Her corporate efficiency, whether for domestic discipline or for dealing, on equal terms, with the rival claims of other churches or with the opposition of the world, was destroyed by hindrances to the election and consecration of bishops and by the prevention of synodical action—a policy that has always been the expedient of the most intelligent tyrants from Licinius¹⁰ to Gaiseric, from Gaiseric to the mediaeval Popes,¹¹ and from the days of papal to the days of Tudor absolutism.¹² (4) Individual Catholics

¹ Victor Vit. i, c. 17 (*Op.* 12; *P. L.* lviii. 202 A, B); Hodgkin, ii. 498 sq. The peace between the Vandal kingdom and the Eastern Empire lasted 476–533; then followed the period of Byzantine rule in Africa, 533–698; and then the Mohammedan conquest.

² Hodgkin, ii. 497 sqq.

³ Ibid. 524.

⁴ Victor Vit. ii, cc. 1, 2 (*Op.* 12 sq.; *P. L.* lviii. 201–3).

⁵ Ibid. iv, c. 2 (*Op.* 33 sqq.; *P. L.* lviii. 235 sqq.). The edict suppresses Catholicism, and substitutes for it the religion of the Council of Ariminum; note this testimony to the influence of that Council.

⁶ Ibid. v, c. 21 (*Op.* 49; *P. L.* lviii. 258 c).

⁷ 2 Macc. ix. 9.

⁸ Acts xii. 23.

⁹ Eus. *H. E.* viii. xvi, § 4.

¹⁰ Eus. *V. C.* i, § 51.

¹¹ There was no Western Council from the fourth century, but government by Decretal and Vicars Apostolic: see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 674. On the value of the African synods, *ibid.* 675.

¹² e. g. the Submission of Clergy, 1532, and the Act of Submission,

were not, as a rule, molested : the end was attained if they were simply disqualified for employment in Government offices.¹ With Gaiseric, as with Henry VIII, it was the organized life of the Church,² and not the religion of the individual, of which the Government sought to make itself master. And this policy stood part of the general scheme of conquest. The hand of Gaiseric, like the hand of Henry VIII, lay as heavy upon the nobles as upon the higher clergy. Deprived of their actual leaders, the Catholic clergy and the aristocracy; the people would be reduced to the condition of rayahs. Not that the Latins of Africa could be turned into Vandals; that would be too much to expect. But they might be made good subjects of the Vandals.³

24 H. VIII, c. 19 (H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents*, Nos. XLIII, LI); and the remarks of R. W. Dixon, *Hist. C. of E.* i. 102, iii. 382.

¹ Victor Vit. i, c. 14 (*Op.* 10; *P. L.* lviii. 198 A).

² Dixon, i. 59, 108.

³ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 634.

CHAPTER XIX

THE CHURCH IN THE WEST UNDER VALENTINIAN III,
425-†55, AND HIS MOTHER, GALLA PLACIDIA,
425-†50 : (vi) ITALY, AND ST. LEO THE GREAT,
440-†61

NEVER subject to Vandals, nor to any other barbarians, was Italy, so long as Galla Placidia, †450, and her son Valentinian III, †455, ruled, and Pope Leo the Great, 440-†61, sat in the Roman See.

I

The fortunes of Italy, during these years,¹ are bound up with the doings of Attila and Ricimer ; barbarians both, but the one the foe, and the other the protector, of the Empire.

§ 1. Attila had planted himself, like Alaric, between East and West, in a position from which he could harry both the Byzantine and the Western Empire. Till the death of Placidia there were about ten or twelve years of peace for Italy. For Attila occupied the period with sending embassies. Of the East, he demanded that the Court should surrender Hunnish princes and Roman merchants, fugitives alike from Attila's dominions.² On the West, he pressed his claims for the altar-plate of the Cathedral of Sirmium and for the dowry of the Princess Honoria. When Sirmium was besieged by the Huns, the bishop of that city had entrusted the sacred vessels of his church to Attila's secretary, Constantius, in order to provide for the ransom of himself and his flock. Constantius took them off to Rome, and raised money on them from Silvanus, a goldsmith. Sirmium was taken ; and Attila, after crucifying Constantius, insisted that the vessels were now his by right of conquest, and that Silvanus also should be surrendered to him for having stolen his property.³ As to Honoria, she was the sister of Valentinian III, and had carried on a flirtation, 434, with an Imperial chamberlain. Galla Placidia, her mother, on discovering this, sent her off to a sort of honourable confinement at the court of Constantinople. But the society of

¹ Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, vol. ii ; *Dynasty of Theodosius*, c. vi.

² Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, ii. 58.

³ *Ibid.* 54.

her middle-aged and almost cloistered¹ cousins, Pulcheria and her sisters, proved uncongenial ; and, in order to escape, she sent her ring to Attila, begging him to deliver her. Glad of the pretext ' he claimed as her betrothed husband one half of the Western Empire which had been bequeathed ', as he alleged, ' to Honoria by her father, but out of which she was kept by her brother's covetousness '.² The dowry, of course, was never paid ; and, after his defeat in Gaul, 451, and retirement north of Pannonia into the plains of Hungary,³ Attila, in 452, entered Italy,⁴ as if to claim it. He came by the well-known route through the Pass of the Pear-tree, and laid siege to Aquileia. A first result of his invasion was the founding of Venice ; for fugitives from the cities of northern Italy which he destroyed took refuge in the lagoons, and built a new settlement there. And a second result was the increased prestige of the see of Rome ; for, while Italy lay at the mercy of the conqueror, Pope Leo, at the head of an embassy sent by Valentinian III, then in the City, went out and met him. Attila received the Pope on the banks of the Mincio,⁵ not far from Mantua. Strange to say, he consented to depart from Italy, though with this one threat upon his lips that he would lay yet heavier calamities on the country unless the Emperor sent him Honoria and the dowry that was due with her. It was the air of sanctity and majesty about Leo that overawed the Hun ; and he died on his return to his country, and his dynasty perished with him. Three years later, the missive of the Empress Eudoxia and sister-in-law of Honoria, summoned Attila's ally, the Vandal Gaiseric, to the siege of Rome 455 ; and again the Pope went out to meet him. He saved the City from bloodshed, and its sanctuaries from defilement⁶ ; and he enhanced still further the authority of the Roman See.

§ 2. The following year saw the beginning of the supremacy of Ricimer in Italy, 456-†72. A Sueve by birth,⁷ as the son of a Visigothic princess he was an Arian ; and he was also the third of those leaders who, in the office of Patrician—a dignity held

¹ Socrates, *H. E.* ix. iv.

² Hodgkin, *Italy, &c.*, ii. 113 ; *Dynasty*, 185.

³ Hodgkin, ii. 110 sqq.

⁴ Ibid. 163 sqq. ; Jornandes [A. D. 550], *Getica*, c. xlii (*P. L.* lxi. 1281 sq.).

⁵ Jornandes, *Getica*, c. xlii (*P. L.* lxi. 1282 B) ; perhaps, at Peschiera, where the Mincio issues from the Lago di Garda, or at Governolo, a village at its junction with the Po, Hodgkin, ii. 178.

⁶ Hodgkin, ii. 283 sq.

⁷ Ibid. 402.

for life,¹ and so of more consideration than any, save the Consul, in the administrative hierarchy—had governed the West from Honorius to Valentinian. Constantius, †423, Aetius, †454, and now Ricimer, was the succession. After defeating the Vandals off the coast of Corsica,² 456, and Avitus, the client of the Visigoths, at Piacenza,³ Ricimer elevated Majorian, 457–†61, to the throne; but he proved too active for his patron, and so was deposed.⁴ Then followed a succession of puppet-Emperors: Severus,⁵ 461–†5, set up by Ricimer; Anthemius, 467–†72, the client of Constantinople; and Olybrius,⁶ †472, the nominee of the Vandal Gaiseric. After the death of Ricimer, †472, followed Glycerius,⁷ 472–†3, the client of his nephew and successor, Gundobad the Burgundian; Nepos, 473–†5, of Constantinople, and, last of all, Romulus Augustulus, 475–†6, the son of Orestes, the representative of 'barbarian' Italy. Thus fell the Western Empire, to the joy, no doubt, of its last enemy, Gaiseric, but almost unnoticed by the rest of the generation that survived its fall.⁸ Then Italy fell under the rule of Arian and barbarian kings—Odovacar,⁹ 476–†93, the soldier of fortune; and Theodoric the Ostrogoth,¹⁰ 493–†526, who reigned as Vicegerent of the Eastern Empire.

II

But Rome itself remained Catholic, and the centre of Western Catholicism under the episcopate of Leo, 440–†61.

§ 3. We have already had occasion to note the first appearance of Leo, as acolyte, 418; and his activities as archdeacon when he intervened with effect first against Nestorianism, 430–1, and then against both Augustinianism, 435, and Pelagianism. We have had much to say of Leo as Pope; of his election; of his theory of the papal authority; and of the way in which he acted upon it in repudiating the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon and in dealing with Hilary, archbishop of Arles. We have devoted no little space to his success, as theologian, in impressing upon the Fourth Oecumenical Council the doctrine of our Lord's one Person in two Natures as expounded in his *Tome*, and in finally exposing the errors of Priscillianism. Further, we have not forgotten Leo as one of the few Popes who was a great preacher.

¹ Hodgkin, ii. 405 sq.

² Ibid. 392.

³ Ibid. 394.

⁴ Ibid. 399 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 437 sqq.

⁶ Ibid. 486 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. 489 sqq.

⁸ Ibid. 540 sqq.

⁹ Ibid. 517 sqq.

¹⁰ Ibid., vol. iii.

III

We have now to consider Leo as bishop of Rome.

§ 4. He found the City entirely Christian : he made and left it Catholic.

True, some survivals of paganism remained. In the year after Leo figures in the order of acolyte, the Prefect of the City, 419–20, was Aurelius Anicius Symmachus,¹ the nephew of the opponent of St. Ambrose and champion of paganism. Volusianus² also carried on this tradition of the old Roman aristocracy. He was *Comes rerum privatarum*³ in 408 ; had propounded to Augustine, 412, some difficulties about the Incarnation,⁴ the abrogation of the Old Testament, and the incompatibility of the Sermon on the Mount with public order⁵ ; and, though uncle to the saintly Melania the younger, 383–†439, maintained his old allegiance when sent to Constantinople, 436, to negotiate the marriage of Valentinian III with Eudoxia the daughter of Theodosius II. Here, however, Volusianus was converted by his niece, and baptized by archbishop Proclus : then, shortly after his baptism, he died.⁶ The Lupercalia, celebrated on 15 February, continued⁷ till it was suppressed by Pope Gelasius I, 492–†6, with scoffs and witticisms at its expense⁸ ; but it was the only relic of popular festivities surviving from paganism. The Temples survived, in the sense that they were not destroyed. But they were closed.

Meanwhile, the outer aspect of the City had long been identified with the profession of Christianity.

Churches⁹ increased as Temples decayed. Constantine had built the Basilica of the Lateran (then the Basilica Constantiniana and now S. Giovanni in Laterano), and the Empress Helena built the Basilica Hierusalem (or Heleniana) now

¹ See the 'Stemma Symmachorum' in Symmachus, *Opera*, xl, ed. O. Seeck (*Mon. Germ. Hist.* vi. i).

² See the 'Stemma Albinorum et Volusianorum' in *ibid.* clxxv.

³ *Cod. Theod.* v. xiv. 7.

⁴ Aug. *Ep.* cxxxv (*Op.* ii. 399–400 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 512–14).

⁵ *Ibid.* cxxxvi (*Op.* ii. 400–1 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 514–15) ; and for Augustine's answer, *Epp.* cxxxvii, cxxxviii (*Op.* ii. 401–19 ; *P. L.* xxxiii. 515–35).

⁶ Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* liii (*Op.* iii. 14 A ; *P. G.* ciii. 93 A, B) ; Fleury, xxvi. xxvii. There is, however, some doubt about this : see *D. C. B.* iv. 1168.

⁷ Gibbon, c. xxxvi (iv. 32).

⁸ Gelasius, *Tract.* vi, ap. A. Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.* 598–607.

⁹ H. Grisar, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages*, i. 188 sqq., with map, or 'Forma urbis Romanae, saec. iv–vii' (1911) ; M. A. R. Tucker and H. Malleon, *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome*, i. 162 sqq.

S. Croce in Gerusalemme. Both of these are situated to the south-east of the City. Constantine also built the extra-mural churches of St. Peter, over the tomb of the Apostle, on the Vatican, to the north-west of the City; of St. Paul, over his tomb, on the Ostian Way, to the south, now S. Paolo fuori-le-mura, which had the honour of being restored, 386, by the three Emperors, Valentinian II, Theodosius I, and Arcadius; of St. Laurence (now S. Lorenzo fuori) on the Via Tiburtina to the east, restored, under Sixtus III, 432-†40, by Galla Placidia; and, finally, of St. Agnes (now S. Agnese fuori) on the Via Nomentana to the north-east. From the days of the first Christian Emperor onwards, nearly every pope is connected with some church either built or restored in his episcopate. Such are the Titulus Silvestri (now S. Martino ai Monti) on the Esquiline, one of the twenty-five *Tituli*,¹ or parish churches, of the City which give their titles to the Cardinals and of which S. Clemente, on the Via papalis² or highway from the Lateran to the Vatican and known to have existed *in situ* under Damasus, is, perhaps, the most famous; the Titulus Marci (now S. Marco) founded in 336 by the Pope of that name; the Titulus Iulii built by Pope Julius, 337-†52, and now S. Maria in Trastevere; the Basilica Iulia which once commemorated its founder by name but is now the Church of the Twelve Apostles; the Basilica Liberii [352-†66] on the Esquiline which Sixtus III restored and dedicated to St. Mary. It is the first church, with the possible exception of the church at Ephesus in which the two Ephesine Councils met, to be dedicated to the mother of our Lord, and is now known as S. Maria Maggiore. The climax of church-building is reached with the pontificate of Damasus, 366-†84, as famous for his inscriptions as for his churches, among which are to be reckoned the Titulus Pudentis, now S. Pudenziana, with a mosaic of the time of Siricius and Innocent I; S. Lorenzo in Lucina³ where Damasus was elected, and S. Lorenzo in Damaso which he built; together with the Titulus Anastasiae, now S. Anastasia. Pope Siricius, 384-†98, had the honour of seeing the complete transformation of St. Paul without the walls. Under Innocent I, 402-†17, a noble Roman lady founded the Titulus Vestinae, which once bore her name, but is now S. Vitale. To the episcopate of Caelestine, 422-†32, belongs

¹ Grisar, i. 189 sqq.

² Ibid. i. 207 sqq.

³ Sometimes 'in prasina', because the 'factio prasina' or 'Green Club' (of the 'green' jockeys) stood there, *ibid.* i. 201.

the Titulus Sabinae, now S. Sabina, on the Aventine. Its doors, of the fifth century, contain two panels.¹ The one represents the Church, where Peter and Paul, its founders at Rome, appear on each side of Mary, who stands for the faithful as an *orante*, and all supplicate the glorified figure of our Saviour above. The other commemorates the Christian Empire, symbolized by the Emperor in a chlamys; who is saluted by a Winged Victory with a church in the background, and accepts the acclamations of the faithful in the foreground. They are made up of two groups: of nobles in the toga and of the people in chasubles—so significant is it to-day of the Catholicity of the Church that the priest at the altar wears the then garb of the average man.² One of Caelestine's legates at the Council of Ephesus, 431, was 'Philip the presbyter of the Church of the Apostle', otherwise the Titulus Apostolorum or Eudoxiae, on the Esquiline, now S. Pietro in Vincoli. The church was restored, under Sixtus III, 432–†40, at the expense of the Imperial family of the East, particularly of Eudoxia, the wife of Valentinian III. Eudoxia's aim was to provide a sanctuary for the chains with which St. Peter had been bound at Jerusalem, brought back by her mother from a pilgrimage to the East. She gave them to Pope Leo; and, with the chains that bound St. Peter at Rome when in prison under Nero, they are accepted and venerated there to this day. This was in the third year of Leo's episcopate, 442; to its last year belongs S. Agata dei Goti, c. 460, on the Quirinal, founded and decorated by Ricimer for Arian worship till reconciled and consecrated, 593, to Catholic use by St. Gregory the Great.

The greater part of these churches were served by their presbyters and readers, as permanently attached thereto as were the later parochial clergy. Outside the City, the Basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul were the principal centres of attraction, for they contained the Tombs of the Apostles. But scarcely less popular

¹ For photograph of the door, see Bury's *Gibbon*, ii. 300 (Methuen, 1909); and of the panels Grisar, i. 328 sqq., and Illustrations 77, 78; and Jo. Wiegand, *Das altchristliche Hauptportal Sabina* (Trier, 1900), Tafel xii, No. 9.

² On this connexion of the 'paenula' with the ordinary man, see A. Fortescue, *The vestments of the Roman Rite*, 6 ([Roman] Catholic Truth Society, 1912). Note also that the N. T. was written in the *Koinḗ* or common tongue, not in literary Greek; and that the Sermon is not, like a Rhetorician's Oration, for display, but a Homily or 'talk' in the common tongue.

centres were the tombs of the Martyrs in the Cemeteries and Catacombs surrounding the City¹; and a pilgrimage to these ranked as an exercise of piety second only to a pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

The centre of government, however, was the Lateran. There stood the *episcopium*,² or bishop's house, and the principal baptistery with its two chapels, the one for men and the other for women, when they put off their clothing in the rite of baptism.³ This building was restored under Sixtus III. From the Lateran the local Roman church was administered, i.e. the entire population of the City, save for the schismatical and heretical remnants now fast disappearing.

§ 5. The Novatianists, hitherto, had maintained their ground. They were a sect native to Rome, of unquestioned orthodoxy; and this may account for the indulgence with which, for more than a hundred and fifty years, they had been regarded. In Rome they had a bishop and several churches; till, at last, their churches were closed by Pope Caelestine and their bishop, Rusticulus, reduced to ministering in private houses. No such severities were dealt out to the Novatianists by the Patriarchs of Constantinople; but Cyril put them down at Alexandria. 'The bishops of Rome and Alexandria', says Socrates, the friend of Novatianists, 'enjoyed an authority more than spiritual.'⁴ We do not know how Alexandria acquired it; but in Italy, Gaul, Africa, and Spain, the popes, as we have seen, constantly intervened with the coercive powers of the State at their disposal—such powers as were granted to them by the legislation of Valentinian I, Gratian, and, to Leo himself, by Valentinian III.

§ 6. These powers Leo next proceeded to invoke against the Manichaeans, 443. They had been under the Imperial ban since the days of Diocletian. Driven underground by his edict,⁵ 296, Manichaeism became the more attractive: while in Africa, where the Imperial legislation against sectaries as often as not failed of enforcement, Manichaeans multiplied greatly. Augustine himself spent nine years among them; not, indeed, as one of their Elect, but as a Hearer. He had never come across anything amiss in the prayer-meetings of Hearers⁶; but of the morals of the Elect

¹ Grisar, i. 198 sqq.; T. and M. i. 367 sqq.

² Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 150, n. 4.

³ Ibid. 312, n. 2.

⁴ Socr. *H. E.* vii. xi.

⁵ Text in J. C. L. Gieseler, *Ecl. Hist.* i. 228.

⁶ *Contra Fortunatum*, § 3 (*Op.* viii. 94 B; *P. L.* xlii. 113).

he had formed but a poor opinion.¹ This opinion was confirmed by abominations that came out, after judicial inquiry, 415, in Paphlagonia and Gaul²; and some years later, 421, at Carthage, where Augustine was one of the Imperial Commissioners.³ At Rome, when, as one of their adherents, he went regularly to Manichæan worship, their congregations were, as yet, undisturbed. But the disclosures just mentioned, coupled with Augustine's long series of anti-Manichæan writings, raised suspicions against the sect; and, after his death, its numbers were swelled, and its reputation not improved at Rome by co-religionists from Africa who had taken refuge in the capital from the invading Vandals.⁴ Rumours of evil-doing reached the ears of Pope Leo,⁵ and he set the police to work. They arrested the Manichæan bishop, and all the Elect in Rome. A mixed tribunal, presided over by the Pope,⁶ and consisting of magnates and clergy, conducted an inquiry: and several, including a youth and a little girl of ten, were found to have been guilty of ceremonial abominations under the direction of the bishop. Some who confessed their fault were put to penance and admitted to the Church; but the rest were sentenced to perpetual banishment.⁷ These were severe measures; and Leo thought it advisable to secure the countenance of the faithful by telling them, in a sermon of December 443, frankly but not too precisely, of the foul deeds done in Manichæan worship.⁸ He also sent the minutes of the Court, by *In consortium vos*⁹ of 30 January 444, to the bishops of Italy, and bade them be on their guard against the recrudescence of the evil in their own dioceses. Finally, at his suggestion, by a rescript¹⁰ of 19 June 445, Valentinian III renewed, in view of recent disclosures, all the

¹ *De moribus Manichæorum*, ii, §§ 67-75 (*Op.* i. 740-4; *P. L.* xxxii. 1373-8).

² *De natura boni*, § 47 (*Op.* viii. 517 F; *P. L.* xlii. 570).

³ Possidius, *Vita*, § 16 (*Op.* x, app. 268 A; *P. L.* xxxii. 46); *De hæresibus*, § 46 (*Op.* viii. 15 B; *P. L.* xlii. 36).

⁴ Prosper, *Chron.* ad ann. 443 (*Op.* 749; *P. L.* li. 600 A, B); for the proceedings of Pope Leo against them, see Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 424 sqq.; Fleury, xxvi. liv.

⁵ Leo tells the people to let their parish priests know where Manichæans are lodging (*Sermo*, ix, § 4 [*Op.* 33; *P. L.* liv. 163 A]); and says that they may be detected by two marks (1) by their keeping Sunday and Monday as fasts, and (2) by Communion in one kind, for they avoid wine as evil (*Sermo*, xlii, § 5 [*Op.* 160 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 279 sq.]). On Communion in one kind see Fleury, iii. 232, note q.

⁶ Leo, *Ep.* viii (*Op.* 626; *P. L.* liv. 622 B).

⁷ *Ep.* vii, § 1 (*Op.* 624; *P. L.* liv. 620 sq.); Jaffé, No. 405.

⁸ *Sermo*, xvi, § 4 (*Op.* 50; *P. L.* liv. 178 c), and Document No. 226.

⁹ *Ep.* vii (*ut sup.*). ¹⁰ = Leo, *Ep.* viii (*Op.* 626; *P. L.* liv. 622 sq.).

penal legislation against Manichaeans since pagan times. He forbade their sect under penalty of incapacitation and exile; though not, as Diocletian, of burning alive. But, from time to time, Manichaeans were still discovered; and a *Commonitorium*,¹ attributed to St. Augustine, supplied rules for dealing with them. It made sharp distinction between Hearers and Elect. The former were required to sign an explicit repudiation of Manes and his errors, and could then be admitted to the status of catechumens, or of penitents, in the Church, according as they were or were not baptized; for, in spite of the false teaching of Manichaeism, the Church admitted the validity of Manichaean baptism. The Elect, for all that they were required to anathematize their past in similar terms, had to submit to long seclusion, under the eye of clerics or Religious, until they were considered ripe for baptism, or penance, as the case might be.

§ 7. The Pelagians were the next to attract the notice of St. Leo. As archdeacon of Rome he had intervened to quiet the controversy between semi-Pelagianism and Augustinianism by his Canons, so-called, of 435; and to Leo have been attributed, though on insufficient grounds, two works of the middle of the fifth century written with the same purpose of conciliation, and from the point of view of a restrained Augustinianism. They are the *De vocatione omnium gentium*,² c. 440, in which the writer says that his aim is to effect a reconciliation between the semi-Pelagians and the orthodox³; and the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos*,⁴ which offered a subtle solution of the problem of predestination. But only a narrow public could have been interested in prolonging the discussion which had gone on incessantly for half a century; and in Rome, at any rate, Pelagians made no figure. They gave some trouble, however, in Venetia; of which Septimus, bishop of Altinum c. 444 (later Altino-Torcello), sent information to Pope Leo. He told him that, in his neighbourhood, clerics who had been involved in the heresy of Pelagius had been admitted to Catholic communion without any repudiation of their errors being required of them; and that they were even allowed to wander from place to place and exercise their ministry at will.

¹ Aug. *Op.* viii, app. 37 sq. (*P. L.* xlii. 1153-6).

² Prosper, *Op.* 847-924 (*P. L.* li. 647-722); Bardenhewer, 515.

³ *De voc. omn. gent.* i, § 1 (Prosper, *Op.* 847; *P. L.* li. 649 A).

⁴ Aug. *Op.* x, app. 1-50 (*P. L.* xlv. 1611-64); written by Marius Mercator, so Bardenhewer, 488, 509.

Leo thereupon wrote¹ to the metropolitan² of Aquileia and, § 1, called attention to the negligence which had permitted such abuses; let him, § 2, summon his provincial synod and require an explicit recantation from all who have come over to Catholic communion from this 'proud error'³; 'proud' it is, § 3, for grace, they say, is given according to the merits of the recipient, whereas, in Scripture, it is a gift. Prompt action, § 4, is essential; and the discipline of the Church against wandering clerics⁴ must be put into force at once. At the end of the century the successors of Leo are still found on the watch against Pelagianism, towards the shores of the Adriatic. Gelasius was informed⁵ of its prevalence in Dalmatia, and wrote, 492, to Honorius, bishop of Salona, not to suffer it.⁶ He also wrote, 493, to the bishops of Picenum that, grieved as he felt over the devastation of towns near Rome at the hands of barbarians, their neglect to deal effectively with Pelagians in their dioceses grieved him still more.⁷

§ 8. Pelagianism was a controversy that originated in Rome: it might well linger on there. Less likely that Eastern heresies should find a footing in the capital; but the Eutychians had established themselves there, in the persons of merchants from Egypt who carried on a propaganda near the church of St. Anastasia in the merchant's quarter. Leo went to the church one Christmas morning, and in a sermon warned the people against them⁸; while, in a sermon which appears to belong to a similar occasion, he makes use of the argument from the Eucharist to the Incarnation⁹ so forcibly employed by Cyril against the Nestorian view of our Lord's Person, and against the Eutychian view of it by Theodoret and Pope Gelasius.¹⁰ It was also against the Eutychians that, towards the end of Leo's pontificate, the *Conflictus Arnobii cum Serapione*¹¹ was written to show that Rome was in

¹ Leo, *Ep.* i (*Op.* 589-93; *P. L.* liv. 593-7)=Jaffé, No. 398.

² *Ep.* ii, § 1 (*Op.* 594; *P. L.* liv. 597)=Jaffé, No. 399.

³ 'Superbi erroris,' *Ep.* i, § 2 (*Op.* 591; *P. L.* liv. 594 B). A deliberate and well-chosen epithet; for the doctrines of original sin and the need of grace are offensive to human pride.

⁴ J. Bingham, *Ant.* vi. iv, §§ 4, 5.

⁵ *Tract.* v in *Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 571 sqq., ed. A. Thiel.

⁶ *Ep.* iv (*P. L.* lix. 30-2; *Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 321 sqq.); Jaffé, No. 625.

⁷ *Ep.* v (*P. L.* lix. 34 sqq.; *Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 325 sqq.); Jaffé, No. 626. The barbarians were Odovacar and Theodoric the Ostrogoth, then contending for supremacy in Italy, Gibbon, c. xxxix (iv. 178 sq.).

⁸ *Sermo*, xcvi, § 1 (*Op.* 372 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 466 B, c).

⁹ *Sermo*, xci, § 3 (*Op.* 356 sq.; *P. L.* liv. 452 B): see also *Ep.* lix, § 2 (*Op.* 977; *P. L.* liv. 868 B).

¹⁰ *Tract.* III (*Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 541 sqq.).

¹¹ *P. L.* liii. 239-322.

agreement with the great doctors of Alexandria. The vigilance of that pontificate swept almost every heresy out of Rome; for Leo's successor, Pope Hilary, 461-†8, was able to induce the Emperor Anthēmius, 467-†72, when on a visit to the Vatican Basilica, to respect the unity of the Roman church.¹

§ 9. But Arianism found footing enough to impair it; for Ricimer, while master of Italy, 456-72, built S. Agata dei Goti, right in the middle of the City, for his co-religionists who adhered to the Creed of Ariminum. He maintained an Arian bishop there; and it was because the Pope had a dissenting rival and not because he laid claim to universal jurisdiction that he now began to sign himself 'bishop of the Catholic church in Rome',² or, more curtly, 'bishop of the Catholic church'. Augustine had been accustomed so to describe himself,³ for he too had a rival in the Donatist bishop of Hippo; and Polycarp was 'bishop of the Catholic church in Smyrna'.⁴

IV

But let the title belong to the bishop of Rome in 'no other sense than it could be used by any other bishop, nevertheless Leo exercised an authority, vaguer indeed but not less real than that of a bishop in his diocese, over the Catholic Church as a whole.

§ 10. In Rome itself the claim to such authority rested upon the local tradition of the presence, once of Peter and Paul, and now of their bodies, or, at least, their tombs, in the Roman church; on precedent; on the sentiment of unity; on 'the words of the Gospel',⁵ i.e. on the Petrine texts, and the part played by Peter in the records of the New Testament. It was an authority, in fact, which had accumulated by being long taken for granted. Any suggestion therefore that the powers of the Roman See were other than inherent was quickly resented; and, though the Popes did, in fact, owe much to the grants both of Councils and of Emperors, Roman sensitiveness was swift to contrast its own ancient inheritance of authority with the new powers specifically bestowed,

¹ Gelasius, *Ep.* xxvi, § 11 (*Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 408); Jaffé, No. 664.

² e. g. Pope Hilary, 465, signs himself 'Hilarus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae urbis Romae', Mansi, vii. 960 A. On this title see E. Bishop in *J. T. S.* (Apr. 1911), xii. 408 sq., and Denny, *Papalism*, § 1234.

³ *Acta Coll. Carth.* Dies III, *ap.* Aug. *Op.* viii, app. (*P. L.* xliii. 828).

⁴ *Mart. Pol.* xvi, § 2.

⁵ The *Decretum* of Damasus [if his], *ap.* *P. L.* xliii. 574 B.

from time to time, by legislation, on the *parvenu* See of Constantinople.¹ Moreover, the authority of that See, by every such bestowal, was defined afresh and, by consequence, limited. Never defined and, by consequence, the more impressive was the religious authority associated with the Roman See. At Rome itself, moreover, such authority found natural support in an undefined sense of the Roman church being served heir to the universal dominion of the City ; and so, by right, ' mother and mistress of all churches ' just as Rome was ' mistress of the world '. ' These are they ', exclaims St. Leo, preaching on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, ' who promoted thee, Oh ! Rome, to such glory that, being made a holy nation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal state, and head of the world through the blessed Peter's holy See, thou didst attain a wider sway by the worship of God than by earthly government. For, although thou wert increased by many victories, and didst extend thy rule on land and sea, yet what thy toils in war subdued is less than what the peace of Christ has conquered.' ² It was not, as the Byzantines would have it, that in the civil dignity of the City lay the basis of the ecclesiastical pre-eminence of the See ; but that pre-eminence in Apostolic foundation was to be expected, as other pre-eminence, for the Eternal City.³

Nor was this view, natural enough in Rome, without recognition elsewhere ; for, in the fifth century, the undefined authority of the Roman See counted for much all over Christendom.

§ 11. In the East the support of Innocent was asked for Chrysostom, of Caelestine for Cyril, and of Leo for Flavian. On the other hand, to interfere only as a makeweight, though in these and other cases, as the decisive makeweight, in a controversy, as Rome had come to do in the fourth and fifth centuries, was not the way to improve her claims to universal authority. In the domestic divisions of the Church of Antioch Rome had figured, it is true, with Athanasius ; but, nevertheless, on the side of a minority in schism. In the troubles of Chrysostom and Eutyches, she had appeared as the mere rival of her old ally, Alexandria. To the East, then, Rome would continually present herself as party to a conflict ; and, while centrifugal tendencies

¹ *P. L.* xiii. 574 B.

² Leo, *Sermo*, lxxxii, § 1 (*Op.* 322 ; *P. L.* liv. 423 A), and Document No. 227.

³ *Ibid.*, § 3 (*Op.* 322 sq. ; *P. L.* liv. 424 A), and Document No. 227.

thus affected Rome no less than the other churches of Christendom, these latter were perfecting their organization and unity round a new and rival papacy or potentate at Constantinople. This organization supplied the East with a new centre of unity in the chief bishop¹ at the Byzantine Court ; with a final authority in the Oecumenical Council ; and in the metropolitans and their provincial synods with *interim*, and often sufficient, machinery. There thus came to be in the East no need of Rome ; and as there were now, in actuality, two Empires and two languages, Rome still counted, it may be, on occasion, but in ordinary times was ignored.

§ 12. In the West respect for the Roman See was, as might be expected, much greater ; but even here there existed degrees in the recognition of its authority.

Thus, over the two hundred sees of the suburbicarian churches,² i. e. of the Roman Patriarchate proper in Southern Italy and the isles, the Pope of Rome possessed an immediate authority like that of the Pope of Alexandria over the hundred sees of his Patriarchal jurisdiction. He confirmed elections ; he held Councils ; and no bishop could be consecrated without his permission.

But, beyond the suburbicarian churches, Leo had less authority than his colleagues of Alexandria and Antioch in their respective spheres. He had no share in the appointments to bishoprics. This belonged in the West to the local metropolitans³ ; or, in Africa, to the senior by consecration in each province. Nor had the Pope any place in the election of a metropolitan : it belonged to the comprovincials. Neither had he a Council of the West at which, as Pope, he could normally preside, and so make himself felt in the choice of bishops. He exerted his influence, instead, by Decretals ; by intervention on complaint, where his decisions were sometimes received but ill as of an authority badly informed by comparison with authorities nearer home ; or by Vicars Apostolic. This last turned out an expedient equally limited in the success which attended it. Damasus, for instance, established a Vicariate for Eastern Illyricum⁴ ; and, though it was continued by men of discretion and captivity such as his successors Siricius and Innocent, they could not make a success of it ; nor prevent that region ultimately passing under the ecclesiastical, as it had

¹ This appears to be the significance of the later title, Oecumenical Patriarch, i. e. the bishop, or patriarch, of the Empire (ἡ οἰκουμένη).

² Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 1201-6.

³ J. Bingham, *Ant.* ix. i, § 11 ; Denny, § 1204.

⁴ Denny, § 1210.

long passed under the civil, control of Constantinople from which they had endeavoured to preserve it.¹ Where they had failed, it was hardly likely that Zosimus would succeed. He tried the experiment of a Vicariate for Gaul, in connexion with the see of Arles²; but in vain.

In Africa there was less for a Pope to do than in any other region of Latin Christendom; for Africa stood alone among Western countries in having developed a more or less standing system of synods, as effective as those of the East. Thus, besides the metropolitan and the provincial Council there, we find superior to these 'a plenary Council of Africa' under the Primate of Carthage. This great prelate, indeed, did not possess an authority over his colleagues equal to that of the Patriarch of Alexandria or Antioch; for the *doyen* of each province had its episcopal appointments in his hands, and was himself put into office not by the Primate but merely by seniority of consecration among his comprovincials. It was not the Primate of Carthage, then, who, like the Patriarch of Constantinople, Alexandria, or Antioch, was the keystone of the ecclesiastical system, but the General Council of Africa. Till the Vandals destroyed it, the African system of Synods enabled Africa easily to dispense with Popes and to keep them at a safe distance.

But, here as elsewhere, the Pope was universally recognized as head of the West. Augustine, for instance, speaks of Pope 'Innocent as president of the Western Church'.³ This only means that the Pope naturally represented all the Latin churches in dealing with the East. There was, however, no regular system, as yet, of provinces and Councils to keep the parts in relation to the centre; the members in dependence upon the head: only *ad hoc* expedients, Decretals or interventions on request.

§ 13. But, owing to the relation set up between the Pope and the State, such expedients issued in the enjoyment by the Pope of an authority over the Church in the West that proved very real. The *Defensores ecclesiae*,⁴ often chosen from *Scholastici*⁵ or barris-

¹ Denny, §§ 1209, 1211.

² Ibid., §§ 1173-8.

³ Aug. *Contra Iul. Pelag.* i, § 13 (*Op.* x. 503 F; *P. L.* xliv. 648).

⁴ First heard of in Rome, 366, when Damasus, through his *Defensor*, claimed the Liberian basilica then occupied by Arsinius: see the letter of Valentinian I, ordering its restitution, in *Cod. Avell. Ep.* 6 (*C. S. E. L.* xxxv. 49).

⁵ The privilege of employing *Scholastici* as *Defensores* was petitioned for by the African Councils of 401 and 407 (*Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, cc. 75, 96, 97;

ters, called in the secular courts to enforce ecclesiastical decisions. Such decisions, where given by the Pope, had behind them the Imperial legislation; and, to see that they were carried out, the Pope sent his *Defensores* into every country in the West. In Africa, 419, this appeal to the secular arm was resented; and so, in 465, was the appearance of a papal *Defensor* in Spain.¹ But they could not have been successfully resisted indefinitely. Had it not been for the fall of the Western Empire, the system would have led to a rapid centralization of the Western Church in the hands of the Pope; and he would have attained a supremacy such as he did not acquire till the Hildebrandine era. But Vandals in Africa and Visigoths in Gaul and Spain took no notice of papal *Defensores*. In those realms, the Imperial legislation, which armed them, did not run. In Italy, under Odovacar,² 476–†93, and Theodoric³ the Ostrogoth, 493–†526, it continued in force⁴; and, with it, papalism, to this extent, took root. For the Roman spirit could never be exorcised from Italy; and, as the years receded from the death of St. Leo, 10 November 461, it received ever-fresh consecration by its connexion with the memory of that great Pope—calm, strenuous, and majestic—in whom it was ideally impersonated.

Mansi, iii. 778 B, 802), and granted by Honorius 15 Nov. 407 (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. ii. 38): see also Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, § 12 (*Op.* x, app. 265 B; *P. L.* xxxii. 43). If chosen from the *scholastici*, the *defensor* had the right of pleading in court, J. Bingham, *Ant.* iii. xi, § 4; *D. C. A.* i. 33 sqq.

¹ Jaffé, Nos. 560–1; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 678 sq.

² Gibbon, cc. xxxvi, xxxix (iv. 49, 176 sq.).

³ *Ibid.*, c. xxxix (iv. 170 sqq.); *Cambr. Med. Hist.* i, c. xv.

⁴ *Ibid.* (iv. 194).

CHAPTER XX

THE EAST AFTER CHALCEDON, 451-82

DURING the ten years that elapsed between the Council of Chalcedon and the death of St. Leo, the Church of the Empire was chiefly occupied in holding out against the reaction in favour of Monophysitism¹ that followed upon its overthrow at the Council.

I

A reaction was to be expected on grounds doctrinal, political, and racial.

§ 1. Doctrinally, the Council had given a triumph to an anti-Cyrrilline orthodoxy: to the standpoint of Leo and Theodoret rather than of Cyril. True, it condemned both Nestorianism and Eutychianism alike. But it was hailed as an act of reparation to his cause, if not by Nestorius himself, at any rate by his followers; and it put Cyril into the shade by lending no countenance to his third letter to Nestorius—the letter with the Twelve Anathematisms; by substituting for his ‘One Nature Incarnate’ the formula of Proclus ‘One Person in two Natures’; and by drafting its *Definition* in such conformity to the *Tome* as to show that it preferred Leo’s balanced statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation to the presentation of it customary with Cyril. Certainly, the Council assumed the harmony of the official language of Cyril with its own and the Leonine formulation. But it ignored the real Cyril, and abandoned him for Leo. Not content, Cyril’s friends wanted these decisions of the Council reversed, and Leo sacrificed to Cyril; nor were they without prospect of success. Stronger after Chalcedon than before, they did not hesitate to drop Eutyches, and they improved upon his doctrine. He made no provision for the permanence of our Lord’s manhood; for he tended to think of His human nature as having been absorbed, after the Incarnation, by His Divine Nature. Monophysitism proper² now began to conceive

¹ Gibbon, c. xlvii (v. 126 sqq.); *C. M. H.* i. 515 sqq.; Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmas*, iii. 99 sqq.; Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 455 sqq.

² Eutychianism, of course, was ‘proper’ or ‘real’ monophysitism. But by ‘proper’, in the text, is meant monophysitism in the usual or con-

of the Divine Nature and the human nature as coalescing, at the Incarnation, into one composite Nature ; with the result that the Lord's Sacred Humanity, necessary, as all in that age would have agreed, for our Spiritual sustenance in the Eucharist, could be genuinely spoken of as permanent. Thus the resistance of the Cyrilline or, as it now became, the Monophysite party ¹ was a growing menace to the dominant orthodoxy.

§ 2. The doctrinal was reinforced by a political opposition, which rendered it the more threatening. At the *Latrocinium* the Cyrillines had carried all before them owing to the influence of Eutyches at Court. But by the death of Theodosius II their hopes were dashed. The orthodoxy of Pulcheria, and Marcian's firm conduct of business at Chalcedon in that interest, gave a triumph to the opponents of the Monophysites which that party continued to resent. There seemed, moreover, to be opening out some prospect of a quarrel between Leo and the Byzantine Court over the twenty-eighth canon ; and it looked as if the Pope, who had been the undoing of their triumph at the second Council of Ephesus, might now be counted on to play into their hands by repudiating the Council of Chalcedon and the Government behind it. But Leo was too great a man to be betrayed into endangering the unity of the Church. His opposition to the canon rose largely out of concern for unity. He saw in the old system of the episcopate ranged under the primacy of the Roman See the only safeguard of ecclesiastical unity ; specially at a time when the unity of the Empire was breaking up into two Empires, with two languages, and when the new pope at Constantinople, by contrast with the Roman See which had less than ever to fear from the moribund Empire in the West, would certainly not be able to maintain his independence of the autocrat on the Eastern throne. Leo therefore took care to let the breach over the twenty-eighth canon be closed ; and set to work, in a series of letters, to stiffen the Government in its resolve to consolidate the decisions of Chalcedon. And not without reason, could Leo have foreseen that, within the next two centuries, the Government, face to face with centrifugal movements within the Empire, would make frequent attempts at compromise, with a view to comprehension of Chalcedonian and Monophysite in one communion.

ventional sense. Its representatives were Dioscorus, Timothy the Cat, &c. They would say that while Nestorians and Chalcedonians separated the two Natures and Eutychians confused them, they simply distinguished them, Tixeront, iii. 107.

¹ Tixeront, iii. 111 sq., 120 sq.

§ 3. Such movements owed their strength to racialism. The fact that the Byzantine Court was itself enforcing the decisions of the Council proved enough to render them odious to the populace in Egypt and in Syria. Coptic and Syriac respectively were spoken in these Patriarchates : they had never adopted Greek. And the prevalence of the vernacular, after centuries of attempted Hellenism, represents the measure of hostility, racial no less than political, to Imperial pressure. On such hostility the Monophysite party could count.

II

And this brings us to the events of the reaction : which we may trace, past its open triumph in the *Encyclical*¹ of the usurper Basiliscus, 476, to the veiled welcome which it received by the *Henoticon*² of Zeno, 482.

§ 4. Its progress varied with changes in the political scene. Marcian died,³ 27 January 457. He had been chief of the staff to the Patrician Aspar⁴ ; and was succeeded by Aspar's steward,⁵ Leo I, 457-†74. To this Emperor's accession belong three points of interest. (a) Leo was the first sovereign for sixty years not of the House of Theodosius ; for that family, which for a full generation had occupied either throne, had now ceased to rule : in the East, by the death of Pulcheria,⁶ July 453, and in the West by the murder of Valentinian III,⁷ 455. Leo thought it an indignity that its surviving princesses should remain captives of the Vandals ; and in 462 he ransomed and brought back from Carthage the Empress Eudoxia, widow of Valentinian III and daughter of Theodosius II, with her daughter Placidia.⁸ (b) Next, Leo was the nominee of Aspar, an Alan or Goth⁹ by race and by religion an Arian. Aspar and his son Ardaburius were strong enough to give away the throne, but not to seize it ; for it was impossible, as yet, for any but a Roman and a Catholic to succeed to the inheritance of Theodosius the Great. But, even so, a prince who was not of the Theodosian House needed further legitimation. In the absence of any survivor of that House to give it, Leo was held to have

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 4 (*P. G.* lxxxvi, 2599 sqq.).

² *Ibid.* iii. 14 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2619 sqq.).

³ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 305.

⁵ *Ibid.* 362.

⁶ *Ibid.* 297.

⁴ *Ibid.* 281.

⁷ *Ibid.* 253.

⁸ She became the wife of the Emperor Olybrius, 472 ; *ibid.* 378.

⁹ *Ibid.* 409.

received it at his consecration by the Patriarch Anatolius, 449-†58. He was thus (c) the first of sovereigns to receive the crown at the hands of the bishops. In 468, to escape from the tutelage of Aspar and his Goths, the Emperor placed himself under the protection of Zeno and a bodyguard of Isaurians, and gave him his daughter Ariadne in marriage.¹ He then bestowed the succession on their little son,² Leo II, and died shortly afterwards. The first and only act of the child was to place the crown on the head of his father, 18 November 474; and thus Zeno became Emperor, largely by the aid of the Dowager-Empress Verina.³ But Verina was not minded to part with the authority she had thus bestowed; and, finding her son-in-law disinclined to share it with her, she took advantage of the unpopularity of the Emperor and his Isaurians to stir up against him her brother, Basiliscus.⁴ The usurper had proved his incompetence when, as commander of the expedition which Leo I sent against the Vandals, he had suffered signal defeat at the hands of Gaiseric⁵; but he now maintained himself for a time—in the fateful year, 476, of the fall of the Western Empire—by relying upon the support of the Monophysite party⁶; while Zeno and Ariadne took refuge in Isauria.⁷ Basiliscus was induced not only to abrogate the theological decisions of the Council of Chalcedon,⁸ but also to abolish its Patriarchate of Constantinople.⁹ But this was a blunder. The Patriarch Acacius,¹⁰ 471-†89, at once took up the challenge; and held out for his lawful sovereign, till Zeno re-entered the city, July 477. The turn of events thus placed Chalcedonian orthodoxy once more in power.¹¹ But Acacius became alarmed at the growing discords of the Empire; and persuaded himself that it would be wise to make terms, if possible, with the defeated party. Taking advantage therefore of the improvement manifest in Monophysite statements of doctrine by contrast with the original Eutychianism, the Patriarch advised the Emperor that, at last, reconciliation of Catholic and Monophysite was not

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 15 (*Op.* 307; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2541); Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. 402 sq.

² Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 17 (*Op.* 309; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2545); Tillemont, vi. 418.

³ *Ibid.* 472.

⁴ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 3 (*Op.* 335; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2597 A); Tillemont, vi. 481. His usurpation lasted Oct. 475–July 477.

⁵ *Ibid.* 398 sqq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 483.

⁷ *Ibid.* 482.

⁸ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 4 (*Op.* 335; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2597 c).

⁹ *Ibid.* iii. 6 (*Op.* 340; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2609).

¹⁰ Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 285–388.

¹¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 7–9 (*Op.* 340–3; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2609–13).

impossible.¹ In the 'statesmanlike'² document called the *Henoticon*, 482, Zeno made the attempt. Its effect was also 'statesmanlike', to purchase the civil unity of the State at the expense of schism in the Church; for the churches of the Empire, during the Acacian Schism, 484-519, were out of communion with Rome and the West. But from the accession of Justin I, 518-†27, a Chalcedonian reaction set in. It reached its height under Justinian, 527-†65; whose schemes of reconquest³ in Italy and Africa required once more the support of the Roman See. Thus the churches of East and West were reunited in common acknowledgement of the Council of Chalcedon; but at the expense of disunion in most of the churches of the East. For thirty-five years James Baradaeus (i.e. Al-Baradai—the ragged—for he went about in the guise of a beggar), bishop of Edessa 543-†78, laboured at the erection of Monophysite churches independent of the official hierarchy of the Empire. From the date of his death, a 'Jacobite' or Monophysite prelate has stood over against the 'Melchite' or Royalist bishop in every important city of the East; and, from the first, the Monophysites carried the majority with them in Egypt, in Mesopotamia or the hinterland of Antioch, and in Armenia.

III

To return, then, to the ecclesiastical events⁴ with which the reaction after Chalcedon began. It raised up trouble in all the Easter Patriarchates, save that of Constantinople; and for thirty years, 451-82, the history of the great sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem turns simply upon the success of Dyophysite or Monophysite in gaining or regaining possession, according to the religious policy of the prince in power.

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 12, 13 (*Op.* 345; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2620).

² Gibbon, c. xlvii, n. 74 (v. 128).

³ *Ibid.*, cc. xli, xliii (vol. iv).

⁴ The authorities are: (1) Zacharias Rhetor [= *scholasticus*, barrister], bishop of Mitylene in Lesbos 536-†53. In 491 he wrote in Greek an ecclesiastical history of events in Palestine and Alexandria from 450. It is now preserved in an abridgement known as books iii-vi of *The Syriac Chronicle of Z. of M.*, tr. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks (1899). It was written from the Monophysite point of view (Bardenhewer, 553); (2) Evagrius, secretary to Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch 569-†94, wrote his *Hist. Eccl.* in six books, covering the period 431-594—'ouvrage sérieux et bien documenté', in continuation of Socr., Soz., and Thdt., and from the orthodox point of view (Bardenhewer, 554); (3) Liberatus, a deacon of Carthage, wrote, c. 560-6, his *Breviarium*, covering the years 428-553. For these authorities, see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 455, n. 1.

§ 5. Thus, in Palestine, Juvenal¹ returned from the Council, as Patriarch of Jerusalem, 451-†8, to find the monks of 'the three Palestines' in an uproar at the instigation of an ex-religious named Theodosius.² This worthy had played his part at the Council³; but, returning to Palestine before Juvenal, had set to work to vilify it for having, in effect, rehabilitated Nestorius⁴ and condemned Cyril by deposing his successor, Dioscorus. Monks abounded in Palestine. There were the solitaries of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, undisciplined save for the few who had come under the hand of St. Euthymius,⁵ 377-†473. There were communities also, such as that of the archimandrite, Passarion,⁶ in Jerusalem; or the double convent, for men and for women, on the Mount of Olives. It had been founded by Melania the younger⁷; but, since her death, 31 December 439, it had been ruled by her almoner and confidant, Gerontius,⁸ †484. Pilgrims, as well as ascetics, flourished in Palestine; and most illustrious of these, there now resided in Jerusalem a greater lady than Melania—Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II. To her the Council of Chalcedon, which the monk Theodosius was so busy in denouncing, was the Council of her sister-in-law, Pulcheria⁹; her Council, and that of her departed husband, was the second synod of Ephesus where Dioscorus, now in exile at Gangra, had had his triumph. The ex-Empress therefore easily lent herself to the party of the insurgent Religious.¹⁰ It enjoyed the favour also of Gerontius, and of personages among the solitaries as well. Now Juvenal had once seconded Cyril and Dioscorus; but he had gone over to 'the enemy' at Chalcedon. He was coming back with the reward of a Patriarchate for his 'treachery'. Theodosius and the monks determined that he should be resisted; while, both into his own see and into the sees of his suffragans, bishops of one mind with the opposition were to

¹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 196-207.

² For this affair see the two letters of Marcian addressed, after its suppression, to the monks of Sinai and Jerusalem (*Conc. Chalced.* iii [Mansi, vii. 483-96]); and Cyril of Scythopolis [A. D. 523-†60], *Vita Euthymii*, cc. lxxii-lxxxvi. The 'three Palestines' had their metropolitical sees respectively at Jerusalem, Scythopolis, and Bostra.

³ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 5 (*Op.* 293; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2514 A).

⁴ *Vita Euthymii*, c. lxxiii (Cotelerius, *Eccl. Graec. Mon.* ii. 261; Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1681).

⁵ *Ibid.* cc. xv, xlii (Cotelerius, ii. 213, 233 sq.); Fleury, xxviii. xxvii; Tillemont, *Mém.* xvi. 76-96.

⁶ *Ibid.*, c. xlii.

⁷ Tillemont, *Mém.* xiv. 232-53.

⁸ *Vita Euthymii*, c. lxxiv (Cotelerius, ii. 262 B).

⁹ Tillemont, *Mém.* xv. 171-83,

¹⁰ *Vita Euth.*, c. lxxxii (Cot. ii. 269).

be intruded. The programme was carried out to the letter ; and Juvenal arrived, under Imperial escort,¹ only to find the gates of Jerusalem closed against him and Theodosius installed in the See.² He took flight to Constantinople ; and, while Theodosius proceeded to set up bishops of his party in the sees of Palestine, Juvenal managed to enlist the intervention of the Eastern Sovereigns. At his request, Marcian wrote, c. 453, to the monks of Palestine ; bade them take no offence at the expression *In two natures* as if it were a novelty ; and vindicated the Council of Chalcedon against the accusation of having rehabilitated Nestorianism.³ Pulcheria also wrote to the monks,⁴ and to Bassa the abbess of a convent at Jerusalem,⁵ to justify her proceedings and to clear the Council against the calumnies of the intruder Theodosius. From letters the Emperor at length went on to action, and issued orders for the arrest of Theodosius, who escaped to Mount Sinai,⁶ and the reinstatement of Juvenal, July 453. Juvenal got things back into good order by a Council, which wrote a synodal letter⁷ to remove mistrust and was itself the recipient of a reassuring communication from Marcian.⁸

At the same time Pope Leo intervened. On 11 March 453 he had already begun to ask for further information about the monks of Palestine in a letter⁹ to his agent, Julian, bishop of Cos ; and, 21 March, he wrote to Julian to say that he had not only complied with a request from Marcian that he should remonstrate with the Empress Eudocia but had induced her son-in-law, Valentinian III, to do the same.¹⁰ He wrote also, 15 June, to the monks¹¹ in explanation of his *Tome* ; and in a letter, of the same date, to Eudocia¹² he exhorted her to reclaim those of them to whom she had lent her patronage and to assure them that the Catholic Faith is equally

¹ *Chron. Zach. Mit.* iii. 5, 6.

² So Marcian, in his letter to the Monks of Sinai, *Conc. Chalc.* iii (Mansi, vii. 484 D).

³ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 9 (Mansi, vii. 487-96) ; Fleury, xxviii. xli.

⁴ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 14 (Mansi, vii. 509-12).

⁵ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 13 (Mansi, vii. 505-8). ⁶ Mansi, vii. 516 A.

⁷ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 20 (Mansi, vii. 520 sq.).

⁸ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 15 (Mansi, vii. 514-18) ; Fleury, xxviii. xlv.

⁹ *Ep.* cxiii, § 3 (*Op.* i. 1192 ; *P. L.* liv. 1026) ; Jaffé, No. 489 ; Fleury, xxviii. xl.

¹⁰ *Ep.* cxvii, § 3 (*Op.* i. 1209 ; *P. L.* liv. 1038 B) ; Jaffé, No. 493 ; Fleury, xxviii. xlv.

¹¹ *Ep.* cxxiv (*Op.* i. 1236-43 ; *P. L.* liv. 1061-8) ; Jaffé, No. 500 ; Fleury, xxviii. xlv.

¹² *Ep.* cxxiii (*Op.* i. 1234 sq. ; *P. L.* liv. 1060 sq.) ; Jaffé, No. 499 ; Fleury, xxviii. xlv.

opposed to Nestorianism and to Eutychianism ; she will let him know, of course, how far she succeeds. We do not know how the Empress took this admonition, at first ; but the troubles that came upon her by the assassination of her son-in-law and by the captivity of her daughter Eudoxia and her grand-daughters Eudocia and Placidia, who were carried off to Carthage, shook her resolution, and caused her to think about returning to the communion of the Catholic Church. She turned for advice to the oracles of the desert ; and, while St. Simeon Stylites warned her that ‘ that scoundrel Theodosius was the instrument of the devil ’,¹ Euthymius informed her that the calamities which had befallen her family in Italy were a punishment for yielding to his villainy. Let her renounce the communion of Dioscorus, and return to the allegiance of Juvenal.² She took the advice : and the effect of her reconciliation with the Patriarch did much to allay the disorders of Palestine.³ They disappeared with the capture of Theodosius by the Imperial police,⁴ and his death in a monastery at Constantinople,⁵ 30 December 457. Marcian himself had died on 26 January of that year ; and next year died Juvenal, five years after restoration to his see. He had held it for forty years,⁶ 418-†58.

§ 6. In Egypt⁷ the resistance of the Monophysites was much more serious. Dioscorus had been exiled to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died, 4 September 454. So long as he lived the populace of Alexandria, with Egypt as a whole, refused to regard him as other than their lawful Patriarch. Four of his suffragans, however, had voted with the majority at Chalcedon⁸ ; and they presently appeared with letters from the Emperor to the Prefect of Egypt bidding him proceed to the election of a bishop of Alexandria. The choice fell upon Proterius, to whom, as archpriest, Dioscorus had committed the care of the church in his absence ; and he was consecrated by the four. But the election was the work of the Court and the city nobles ; and, in spite of the connexion of Proterius with his late chief Dioscorus, the mob broke out into riots against him. With them it was a question not so much of prefer-

¹ *Vita Euth.*, c. lxxxiii (Cot. ii. 271 A).

² *Ibid.*, c. lxxxv (Cot. ii. 272 sq.).

³ *Ibid.*, c. lxxxvi (Cot. ii. 273). Gerontius, however, held out, Fleury, xxviii. lx.

⁴ *Chron. Zach. Mit.* iii. 9.

⁵ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 473, n. 1.

⁶ Fleury, xxix. xiii.

⁷ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 5, 8 (*Op.* 292 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2509 sqq.); Liberatus, *Brev.* xiv, xv (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1016 sqq.); *Chron. Zach. Mit.* iv. 1 ; Fleury, xxviii. xxxv ; Neale, *Patr. Al.* ii. 1 sqq.

⁸ Mansi, vi. 681 E, 684 A.

ence¹ for *Of two natures* as against *In two natures*, as for Egyptian nationalism against Byzantine Imperialism. The rioters, of course, were suppressed, at last, by a strong force of soldiery sent from Constantinople; but Proterius could never dispense with a military escort, so insecure was his hold, till the death of Marcian. That event gave his opponents the chance they were awaiting.

On the accession of Leo I, 457-†74, a monk named Timothy, nicknamed the Cat, took advantage of the absence in Upper Egypt of the General in command to raise a tumult. The result of it was that, 16 March, he was consecrated in the church of the Caesareum to be Patriarch of Alexandria, 457-†77, in true succession, as his adherents would say, to their late Patriarch, Dioscorus. Timothy had but two consecrators, both of whom had previously been deposed by Proterius and the Egyptian synod²; and, after playing the anti-Patriarch for a few days,³ he was expelled by the General, Dionysius. Whereupon his partisans took their revenge by hunting Proterius into the baptistery of the church of Quirinus, where they murdered him on Maundy Thursday, 28 March, 457. They then dragged his remains round the city and, after feasting upon them like cannibals, burnt them and scattered his ashes to the winds.⁴ The friends of Proterius lost no time in putting their case before the Emperor Leo I,⁵ and his Patriarch, Anatolius,⁶ at Constantinople. Meanwhile, 'rumours of the misdeeds of the Alexandrian populace'⁷ reached Pope Leo by 1 June 457; but it was only by 'the report of his brother and fellow-bishop Anatolius'⁸ that he was enabled to take precise note of the situation. The Monophysites, Anatolius informed him, had demanded another Council to revise the conclusions of Chalcedon, and the Emperor had refused their request. This, of course, was to the good; but Pope Leo still thought it desirable to keep the Government loyal to its refusal. He therefore wrote three letters,⁹ on 11 July, to the Emperor, to Anatolius, and to his agent Julian, bishop of Cos, pointing out the supreme importance of holding fast to the Synod of Chalcedon, and

¹ As apparently in Jerusalem, where, says Evagrius, it all arose over the substitution of one letter, of *ἐν* for *ἐκ*, *H. E.* ii. 5 (*Op.* 294; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2513 c).

² *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 22 (Mansi, vii. 525 c).

³ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 22, 23 (Mansi, vii. 524-35); Fleury, xxix. ii.

⁴ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 22 (Mansi, vii. 526 sq.).

⁵ *Ibid.* iii. 22 (Mansi, vii. 524 sqq.).

⁶ *Ibid.* iii. 23 (Mansi, vii. 531 sqq.); Fleury, xxix. iv.

⁷ Leo, *Ep.* cxliv (*Op.* 1299; *P. L.* liv. 1112 sq.).

⁸ *Ep.* cxlv, § 1 (*Op.* 1300; *P. L.* liv. 1113 B).

⁹ *Epp.* cxlv-cxlvii (*Op.* 1300-6; *P. L.* liv. 1113-16); Jaffé, Nos. 520-3.

begging the Emperor to provide a Catholic bishop for Alexandria. These representations he followed up, on 1 September, by a second series¹: to the Emperor, expressing his gratification that his Majesty had guaranteed the inviolability of Chalcedon—for, till the death of Aspar, †471, it must be remembered, Leo was surrounded by Arian influences; and to the bishops of leading sees, such as Basil, Patriarch of Antioch, 456-†8, and Euxitheus, bishop of Thessalonica, assuring them of his confidence that, on this point, the Government was sound. During the autumn, however, the partisans of Timothy sent petitions² to put it to the proof; and, though these emanated only from four bishops,³ the four had the hardihood to declare that their Creed was that of Nicaea only, neither more nor less; that, while they accepted the two Councils of Ephesus—the assemblies, that is, of Cyril and Dioscorus—they repudiated the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, Court Councils both; and, in conclusion, that they would be obliged by an answer being forwarded to their archbishop, Timothy. The Emperor referred this communication to Anatolius, and asked for the opinion of the Home Synod as well on the validity of the consecration of Timothy as on the point of upholding the Council of Chalcedon.⁴ The Synod replied that Timothy's consecration was null, and that to reopen the decisions of the Council would be to open the flood-gates of confusion in every church.⁵ A circular letter, in terms very much the same as those of the letter to Anatolius, was next sent to the chief bishops of Christendom⁶ and to three famous solitaires⁷—Simeon Stylites, James, and Baradat—who, in popular esteem, took rank with them. The replies were unanimous. From bishops, we may select the replies of Leo and Anatolius. 'We can see no need', wrote Leo,⁸ 1 December 457, 'to, § 1, reconsider the decisions taken at Chalcedon. Indeed, § 2, the proposal comes from anti-Christ. Timothy, § 3, is a usurper.

¹ Leo, *Epp.* cxlviii-cl (*Op.* 1305-12; *P. L.* liv. 1117-21); Jaffé, Nos. 524-6.

² *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 24 (Mansi, vii. 536 sq.); Fleury, xxix. iv.

³ Leo, *Ep.* clvii, § 2 (*Op.* 1327; *P. L.* liv. 1133 A).

⁴ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 21 (Mansi, vii. 521 sq.); Fleury, xxix. v.

⁵ *Ibid.* iii. 26 (Mansi, vii. 537 sq.); Fleury, xxix. v. The other side said that Anatolius did not want 'the honours unjustly granted to his See' to be brought into question, *Chron. Zach. Mit.* iv. 5.

⁶ For their names, appended to *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 21, see Mansi, vii. 523 sq.

⁷ *Thdt. Rel. Hist.* xxi, xxvi, xxvii (*Op.* iii. 1234 sqq.; *P. G.* lxxxii. 1431 sqq.), and Fleury, xxix. vi-viii, xviii. For the letter of Baradat, in reply, see *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 61 (Mansi, vii. 623 sq.); Fleury, xxix. xii.

⁸ *Ep.* clvi (*Op.* 1321 sqq.; *P. L.* liv. 1127 sqq.); *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 25 (Mansi, vii. 537); Jaffé, No. 532.

The petitions, § 4, presented to your Majesty by either side furnish argument enough: the first, from Catholics, is authenticated by names; the other is unsigned, and has therefore no title to consideration. Let your Majesty, therefore, § 5, seize the opportunity to evince your loyalty to the Faith; of which, § 6, I hope, before long, to send you a detailed exposition. Anatolius was equally emphatic against reopening the questions closed at Chalcedon. Sixty metropolitans, in all, had been consulted with a view to their consulting their synods; and of the sixty, thirty-six of whose letters are extant,¹ all but one, Amphilochius, bishop of Side 426-†58, and metropolitan of Pamphylia I, replied in favour of ranking Chalcedon along with Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus as an Oecumenical Council; while even Amphilochius repudiated Timothy.² St. Simeon Stylites, as he informs us in an extant letter to his Patriarch, Basil of Antioch, concurred.³ The Government thus succeeded in circumventing the demand for a Council, and yet in securing the authoritative decision of the Church; for the consent of the episcopate is final by whatever method, of votes collected by letter or of votes given in Synod, it be attained. To this consent Leo added the weight of his 'second Tome', 17 August 458, as the exposition⁴ which he promised⁵ to the Emperor has been called.⁶ It was intended for the benefit of Timothy. But, though the Emperor pressed it upon him,⁷ Timothy refused it absolutely. 'Its statements', he said, 'are Nestorian.'⁸ Timothy therefore was banished, at first to Gangra,⁹ and ultimately, as he continued his rôle of agitator, to the Crimea¹⁰; and there he remained till 475, the year of the death of Leo I, fervently occupied in defending his own theological position and combating the tenets alike of Eutyches and of the Council of Chalcedon.¹¹ No sooner was he got rid of than the Government proceeded to fill his place. The Proterians elected another Timothy, 459-†82,¹² nicknamed Salofaciolus, or

¹ *Conc. Chalc.* iii. 25-60 (Mansi, vii. 537-622); Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. xv (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1018 c); Fleury, xxix. xii.

² Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 10 (*Op.* 302 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2532 B); *Chron. Zach. Mit.* iv. 7.

³ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 10 (*Op.* 303; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2533); Fleury, xxix. ix.

⁴ *Ep.* clxv (*Op.* i. 1353-1400; *P. L.* liv. 1155-90).

⁵ *Ep.* clxvi, § 6 (*Op.* i. 1325; *P. L.* liv. 1131 c).

⁶ *sc.* by Pope Martin I, 649-†53 (*P. L.* liv. 1151-2 *ad fin.*).

⁷ *Chron. Z. M.* iv. 5 *ad fin.*

⁸ *Ibid.* 6.

⁹ *Ibid.* 9.

¹⁰ Liberatus, *Brev.*, c. xvi (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1019 D); *Chron. Z. M.* iv. 11.

¹¹ *Chron. Z. M.* iv. 12.

¹² *Ibid.* iv. 10; Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 11 (*Op.* 303 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2534 c).

Wobble-cap¹; and, by his opponents, the Royalist or Melkite. He was thus the first to bear the name by which the nationalist and Monophysite majority in Syria and Egypt afterwards marked their contempt for the Orthodox remnant as slaves to the religion of the Court. Personally, however, they liked Timothy Salofaciolus. He had a good heart, and a kind word for everybody, even for the fanatics who regarded his communion with horror. 'We love you well,' they used to say to him in the street, 'though we do not want you for our bishop.'² The last three extant letters³ of Pope Leo were written, 18 August 460, to congratulate the new Patriarch, and his clergy, and certain Egyptian bishops, on his election. 'Let him be on his guard against heresy, and keep us constantly informed at Rome.' Leo, perhaps, had reason to think him too accommodating⁴; and so it turned out. For the Catholic Patriarch of Alexandria consented to restore the name of Dioscorus to the diptychs⁵; till 478, when he received a reprimand⁶ from Pope Simplicius, 468-†83.

The accession of Zeno,⁷ 474-†91, made but slight difference, at first, to the ecclesiastical situation in Egypt; for though, when in command at Antioch, he had compromised himself with the Monophysites, as Emperor he suffered himself, like his predecessor, to be kept loyal to the *Tome* and the Council by the Patriarch of Constantinople. But Acacius carried less weight with the usurper, Basiliscus,⁸ 475-7, who had in his train friends of the exiled Timothy of Alexandria. Yielding to their suggestions and, it is said, to the entreaties of his wife Zenonis, the intruder made a bid for the support of the Monophysites throughout the Empire. He recalled their leader Timothy, and handed him the *Encyclical*,⁹ 476. It was a document entirely in harmony with Timothy's ideas; for by it the Government gave its sanction to the two Councils of Ephesus,¹⁰ and denounced at once the errors of Eutyches and the novelties of

¹ *Chron. Z. M.* p. 62, n. 1.

² Liberatus, *Brev.* xvi (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1021 A).

³ Leo, *Epp.* clxxi-clxxiii (*Op.* i. 1435-8; *P. L.* liv. 1215-18); Jaffé, Nos. 548-50.

⁴ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 5.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. 10.

⁶ *Ep.* xi (*P. L.* lxxviii. 49 c); Jaffé, No. 580.

⁷ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii. 17, iii. 1 (*Op.* 309 sq., 333 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2545 sqq., 2593 sqq.); Fleury, xxix. xxxiii.

⁸ Evagrius, iii. 3 (*Op.* 334 sq.; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2597 sq.); Fleury, xxix. xxxiii.

⁹ *Ibid.* iii. 4 (*Op.* 335-7; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2599-2604); *Chron. Z. M.* v. 1; Fleury, xxix. xlvi; tr. in J. C. Ayer, *Source-book for ancient Church History*, 523-6, and Document No. 234.

¹⁰ *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2600 D.

Chalcedon.¹ All the bishops were required to confirm it by their signatures ; and while, for clerics, refusal was to involve deposition, on the part of the laity any demonstration in favour of Chalcedon was to be visited with exile and confiscation.² Timothy, after eighteen years of exile, 458-76, would now feel that his hour of triumph was come ; and he lost no time in making the most of it. Hastening from the Crimea to Constantinople, he landed amid the cheers of Alexandrian sailors ; and was escorted by the people to lodgings reserved for him in the Palace.³ Thence he intended, by making a solemn entry into St. Sophia,⁴ to force the hand of Acacius. But Acacius was well aware that, if the anti-Chalcedonian reaction were to succeed, then with the doctrine of that Council the newly won powers of the See of Constantinople would also go by the board. So at his nod, no doubt, the Chalcedonian monks of the capital⁵ barred the way of Timothy to the cathedral. Acacius clothed its pulpit and altar in black⁶ for his reception, and closed all the other churches against him. The Eutychians also who, equally with the Catholics, had come in for Timothy's displeasure, joined in to repel him. ' Let him go back into exile, to where he came from ! ' ⁷ Foiled in the capital, Timothy thought it prudent to withdraw ; but, on his way home, he endeavoured to retaliate upon Acacius by stopping at Ephesus to reinstate in that see a bishop named Paul whom the Ephesians had put in without reference to the see of Constantinople, or to the canon of Chalcedon which gave it authority over them. Acacius had therefore deposed him ; and Timothy halted to summon a Council at Ephesus. The Council reaffirmed the autonomy of Ephesus, deposed Acacius,⁸ and wrote to the Emperor to beg his support.⁹ Timothy then continued his journey to Alexandria, where he re-established himself without difficulty. The mild Salofaciolus retired to his Pachomian monastery at Canopus, content to live on an allowance from his

¹ *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2601 B.

² *Ibid.* 2604 A. For the signatories, ' about 500 ', see *ibid.* iii. 5 (*Op.* 338 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2603 sq.) ; *Chron. Z. M.* v. 2, 3.

³ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 1.

⁴ Theodorus Lector, *H. E.* i. 30 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 180 c). For this Theodore, a Reader in the church of CP., of the sixth century, see Bardenhewer, 552

⁵ Simplicius, *Ep.* iv (*P. L.* lviii. 44 B) ; Jaffé, No. 574 ; Fleury, xxix. xlv.

⁶ Theod. Lector, *H. E.* i. 32 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 181 A).

⁷ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 4 ; note this, and v. 1, for the difference between the doctrine of Eutyches and of Monophysitism as represented by Timothy.

⁸ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 6 (*Op.* 340 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2008 sq.).

⁹ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 3.

rival of a penny a day. The remains of Dioscorus Timothy also brought back with him to Alexandria in a silver casket,¹ and laid to rest by the side of his predecessors in the See. And thus Timothy awaited the next move of Acacius.

§ 7. Meanwhile, in Syria, the Monophysite reaction had enjoyed, up to the usurpation of Basiliscus, a like measure of success. From early times Antioch had produced a succession of teachers whose tendency was to look upon our Lord as a man who became God. The Ebionites, Paul of Samosata, Diodore, Theodore, Nestorius, were all inclined to minimize His Godhead for the sake of affirming His manhood. But there had also been in existence, from the first, a rival tradition at Antioch which tended to evacuate His humanity because it had so firm a conviction of His Divinity. In the second century the Docetics had denied the *reality* of our Lord's human nature, as early as the days of Ignatius. His condemnation of them² may have been prompted by the Docetism of Saturnilus,³ his contemporary at Antioch and one of the Syrian school of Gnostics. In the fourth century Apollinaris, bishop of the neighbouring Laodicea in Syria had denied the *completeness* of our Lord's human nature. In the fifth the tendency showed itself in Monophysitism, some forms of which were incompatible with the *permanence* of our Lord's human nature ; and at Antioch the monk Maximus, though a deacon of John the friend of Nestorius, adhered so ardently to the Christology of Cyril that the latter had to write and check his zeal.⁴ There was thus a rift beginning to appear between the people and the hierarchy of Syria ; and the theology of the Greek-speaking episcopate ran counter to the sympathies of the monks and the Syriac-speaking populace. The misfortunes of Ibas and Theodoret are sufficient to show how the official theology of Antioch was falling into discredit in the country of its origin. At the Council of Ephesus, under Dioscorus, several bishops of Syria passed over to the side opposed to that of their predecessors ; and, though this process was due in part to the influence of the Government being placed at the disposal of Eutyches and Dioscorus, there is proof that other than Courtly influences were at work for Monophysitism in Syria. The influence of the Government had passed over to the side of the Orthodox before Chalcedon ;

¹ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 4.

² *Ad Smyrn.* i-vii ; *Ad Trall.* ix.

³ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* i. xxiv, § 2 ; Ps.-Tert. *Adv. omn. haer.* i.

⁴ *Epp.* lvii, lviii (*Op.* x. 192 ; *P. G.* lxxvii. 320 sq.).

and yet, in spite of this, no sooner had the Council decided upon the restoration of Theodoret, than the Cyrilline party, far from losing in importance, showed that it was a power to be reckoned with. The monks of Mesopotamia rallied to it; while, to devout folk throughout Syria, Monophysitism alone appeared to guarantee the Divinity of the Saviour. It was thus, like Sabellianism in the third century, the religion of piety; whereas the belief of the Government, the Council, and the Roman church was held to be indistinguishable from Nestorianism. If Monophysitism was persecuted, so much the stronger case for its being the truth!

Martyrius, Patriarch of Antioch, 460-70, was the first to encounter the forces of Monophysitism headed by Peter the Fuller.¹ Peter had belonged to the community of the Acoemetæ. But he quarrelled with them; and became a priest at Chalcedon where he presided over the monastery of St. Bassa. The Acoemetæ were ardent Chalcedonians: to Zacharias of Mitylene, Nestorians.² Peter therefore transferred himself to the opposite party; and, having attached himself to the retinue of Zeno who, upon his marriage, 468, with Ariadne, the daughter of Leo I, proceeded to Antioch as commander-in-chief of 'the East', Peter not only took the lead of the Monophysite party there and drove out Martyrius but, with the aid of Zeno, established himself, 470, as Patriarch in his place.³ Martyrius carried complaint to Constantinople, where the Patriarch Gennadius, 460-†71, came to his rescue⁴ and procured the exile of Peter to the Oasis⁵ under an order now recalled by *Qui in monasteriis*⁶ of 1 June 471. But the exile was commuted

¹ Theodorus Lector, *H. E.* i. 20 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 176 A); Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 5, 8, 16 (*Op.* 338, 341 sq., 349; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2604 B, 2613 A, 2628 A); Gelasius, *Tract.* i, § 12 (*Epp. Rom. Pont.* 518: ed. A. Thiel).

² *Chron. Z. M.* vii. 7.

³ It was in the course of these tumults that, in order to insist on the Divinity of Him who suffered upon the Cross, Peter inserted into the *Trisagion* ['Holy God, Holy and Strong, Holy and Immortal, have mercy upon us'] the words, 'Who wast crucified for us', before the refrain, Theod. Lector, *H. E.* i, § 20 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 176 B). If the *Trisagion* was addressed to our Lord, then the addition was unexceptionable, and probably Peter regarded it as addressed to Him. But at CP. (Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 44 (*Op.* 381, 2700 A) the *Trisagion* was addressed to the Trinity; and the addition would then be denounced as patripassian or theopaschite. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. of Dogmas*, iii. 100 sq. For the *Trisagion* in the Liturgy see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies*, i. 590; L. Duchesne, *Chr. Worship*⁵, 191, 193, 197, 249; A. Fortescue, *The Mass*, 90, 96, 102.

⁴ Theod. Lector, *H. E.* i. 21 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 176).

⁵ Gelasius, *Tract.* i, § 12 (*Epp. R. P.* 518).

⁶ Justinian, *Codex*, i. iii. 29.

to internment with the *Acoemetæ*.¹ They kept him safe till the end of the reign of Leo I; nor did Zeno, at his accession, 474, release him. But on the usurpation of Basiliscus and the arrival of Timothy the Cat in Constantinople, Peter was sent for and put into possession, for the second time,² of the throne of Antioch, 475-6. The triumph of the Monophysites, however, proved short-lived; and, on the return of Zeno, 477, a second order was issued for the banishment of Peter, this time to Pityus in the Caucasus. Fortune again saved him from being sent so far afield; and again he was interned, this time with the Massalians at the sanctuary of St. Theodore in the province of Helenopontus. His friends endeavoured to enthrone in his place a protégé of his, John Codonatus³; but without success, for the Government put in Stephen, 478-†82. He fell a victim to the Monophysites, who murdered him in church by running him through with pointed reeds.⁴ An Orthodox election at Antioch was quite impossible; so Acacius 'provided' Calandion.⁵ He was Patriarch, 482-5; but then had to give way to Peter the Fuller who thus occupied the throne for the third time,⁶ 485-†8. The mere record of these events is enough to show the daring of the Monophysites, and to what impotence they had reduced both the see of Antioch and the school of Diodore and Theodore, of Nestorius and Theodoret, so long and so intimately associated with it. Nor was the situation different in Jerusalem, where the successor of Juvenal, Anastasius, was Patriarch, 458-†78, and signed⁷ the *Encyclical* of Basiliscus.

Thus in 475-7 the Monophysite reaction had everywhere risen to the crest of the wave. At Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, three out of the four Eastern Patriarchs had signed the *Encyclical*. But for the opposition of Acacius, everything was going well from the point of view of Timothy the Cat. It remains only to consider the check, and the ultimate advantage that his cause sustained by the course of events in the capital.

¹ *Synodicon*, ap. Mansi, vii. 872 B, and Gelasius, *Tr.* i, § 12.

² Theod. Lect. *H. E.* i. 22 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 176 sq.); Liberatus, *Brev.* xviii (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1027 B, c). This last is the fullest and shortest account of Peter the Fuller.

³ Theophanes [†817], *Chronographia*, A. C. 469 (*Op.* 107; *P. G.* cviii. 309 c); Fleury, xxix. xlviii, xlix. l.

⁴ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 10 (*Op.* 343; *P. G.* lxxvi. 2613 c).

⁵ *Ibid.* (2616 A): see also Pope Simplicius, *Epp.* xiv, xv [of 22 June 482] to Zeno and Acacius (*P. L.* lviii. 51 sqq.); Jaffé, Nos. 584-5.

⁶ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 16 (*Op.* 349; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2629).

⁷ *Ibid.* iii. 5 (*Op.* 338; *P. L.* lxxxvi. 2604 c).

§ 8. At Constantinople, Acacius refused to sign the *Encyclical*, and threw himself for support upon the monks of the city, mostly Chalcedonian ; and, in particular, on St. Daniel the Stylite. The saint descended from his column,¹ and, rousing the populace,² so overawed Basiliscus by foretelling the speedy return of Zeno that the usurper at once endeavoured to forestall it by revoking his former pronouncement in the *Anti-encyclical*.³ By this document he reaffirmed the decisions of Chalcedon in regard both to the Faith, and to the privileges accorded to the see of Constantinople. But it was too late to save himself by any such expedient ; and Zeno re-entered the city, July 477. Having got rid of Basiliscus, whom the Patriarch delivered up even from the sanctuary, Zeno put out an edict reversing his measures affecting religion and restoring the *status quo ante*.⁴ In a letter⁵ of 9 October 477 he received the congratulations of Pope Simplicius, 468-†83, on his recovery of the throne. 'Let your Majesty', urged Simplicius, 'now deliver the churches, and, in particular, the church of Alexandria, from intruders ; and suffer no indignity to be offered to the Council of Chalcedon or to the *Tome* of Leo.' To Acacius also Simplicius wrote in similar terms on the same date.⁶ 'Let him put pressure on the Emperor to send Timothy the Cat into perpetual exile ; and let him remind his Majesty that Paul of Ephesus, Peter the Fuller, and his protégé John of Apamea deserve the same sentence.' These three last were quickly ousted⁷ ; but Timothy the Cat, as the Prefect of Egypt represented to the Emperor, was too old to be disturbed ; and, indeed, he died—it was said, of poison at his own hand—within a few months of the restoration.⁸ But his death did not end the schism in Egypt ; for his archdeacon, Peter, surnamed Mongus⁹ or the Stammerer, was elected by the Monophysite party to the See which he held, 477-†90, the election taking place in spite of the fact that the Catholic Patriarch,

¹ Theod. Lect. *H. E.* i. 32 (*Op.* 570 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 181 A) ; *Chron. Zach. Mit.* v. 5.

² Theod. Lect. *H. E.* i. 33 (*Op.* 570 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 181 B).

³ See it in Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 7 (*Op.* 341 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2609 sqq.) ; and see also Theod. Lect. *H. E.* i. 34 (*Op.* 570 ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 181 C).

⁴ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 8 (*Op.* 341 sq. ; *P. G.* lxxxvi. 2612 sq.) ; Fleury, xxix. xlx.

⁵ Simplicius, *Ep.* viii (*P. L.* lviii. 44 sq.) ; Jaffé, No. 576.

⁶ *Ep.* [xix] (*P. L.* lviii. 59 sqq.) ; Jaffé, No. 577—in answer to a report on the situation sent by Acacius through the deacon Epiphanius (*P. L.* lviii. 59 C).

⁷ *Chron. Z. M.* v. 5 ; Fleury, xxix. l.

⁸ Liberatus, *Brev.* xvi (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1020 A).

⁹ W. Bright in *D. C. B.* iv. 336-8.

Timothy Salofaciolus, was still alive. Justly indignant at this irregularity, the Emperor sent orders to the Prefect of Egypt to put Mongus to death, to punish his supporters, and to reinstate Salofaciolus.¹ But by the kindly intervention of Salofaciolus, so characteristic of him, the Monophysite Patriarch was only banished. The Catholic Patriarch was thus restored; and for five years, 477-82, retained the See. Then, falling ill of a mortal sickness, he sent a deputation to Zeno, at the head of which was John Talaïa, to procure the guarantee of the Government for a free election on the next vacancy at Alexandria. On the return of the embassy, Timothy Salofaciolus died,² 482, and John was unanimously elected.³ But, by an unfortunate mistake, which had disastrous consequences, he contrived to give deep offence to Acacius. By the usual synodal letters he informed the sees of Rome and Antioch of his consecration; and wrote a similar letter, containing the news of it, for the Patriarch of Constantinople. But instead of posting it direct, he sent it under cover to Illus, a former intimate of his own and now Master of the Offices; as if, by this means, it would reach the Emperor and the Patriarch with more effect. Illus, at this time, was at Antioch; and before the enclosure could reach Acacius, that prelate had learned, from another source, of the election of John. He took offence at the slight thus put upon him; and so did a kinsman of Salofaciolus, Gennadius by name, who had been made by him, in conjunction with Talaïa, his *aprocrisarius*, or agent, at Constantinople.⁴ Together, Acacius and Gennadius determined to ruin John Talaïa, and put Peter Mongus in his place. They represented to the Emperor that Peter, after all, was acceptable to the people⁵ at Alexandria, and not really at variance with the Faith; and they prevailed upon Zeno to suggest this course to Pope Simplicius. 'If charges are to be made against John,' replied the Pope, 15 July 482, 'by all means let his election stand over while they are investigated; but the appointment of a heretic, such as Peter Mongus, is not for a moment to be contemplated.'⁶ Irritated at this curt rejection of his plans, the Emperor

¹ Liberatus, *Brev.* xvi (P. L. lxxviii. 1020 B); Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 11 (P. L. lxxviii. 2616).

² Liberatus, *Brev.* xvi (P. L. lxxviii. 1021 A).

³ Gelasius, *Tract.* i, §§ 9, 10 (Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 516); Liberatus, cc. xvi, xvii (P. L. lxxviii. 1020-2); Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 12 (P. G. lxxxvi. 2617 sqq.); *Chron. Z. M.* v, §§ 6, 7; Fleury, xxix. lii; Neale, *Patr. Al.* ii. 19 sqq.

⁴ Liberatus, *Brev.* xvi (P. L. lxxviii. 1020 c).

⁵ *Ibid.*, c. xvii (P. L. lxxviii. 1022 c).

⁶ Simplicius, *Ep.* xvii (P. L. lviii. 55 sqq.); Jaffé, No. 587; Fleury, xxix. liii.

was the more bent upon giving them effect. He sent instructions for the banishment of John, and the installation, at Alexandria, of Peter Mongus.¹ At the same time he addressed to the bishops of Egypt the *Henoticon*,² 482, or *Instrument of Union*; which, drawn up, as it was, by agreement between Acacius and Peter, was for the latter to sign³ as the price of his recognition in the See. It begins by setting forth the desire for reunion and the losses⁴ due to division. As the basis of union, the Nicene Creed is enough: it was reaffirmed at the Council of Constantinople and accepted by those who, at the Council of Ephesus, condemned Nestorius. The document then goes on to denounce Eutyches and to approve the Twelve Articles of Cyril; and, after an unexceptionable *résumé* of the Faith, it concludes by anathematizing any who believe, or have believed, whether at Chalcedon or elsewhere, anything to the contrary thereof.⁵ But to approve the Twelve Anathematisms of Cyril and to leave the authority of the *Tome* and of Chalcedon an open question was, while nominally retaining, really to reverse the settlement there attained. It was to put Leo second to Cyril and the Anathematisms above the *Tome*. The Church of the Byzantine Empire thus became officially Monophysite; and, in two directions, results followed of first importance. In the West relations between Rome and Constantinople were suspended by the Acacian schism,⁶ which lasted for thirty-five years. In the East the Church of Persia broke away into a counter-organization of its own; and Christianity there received the protection of 'the King of Kings' precisely because its creed was Dyophysite and the very opposite of the now Monophysite religion of 'the Lord of the World'.

¹ Liberatus, *Brev.* xvii (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1022 sq.); Gelasius, *Tract.* i, § 10 (Thiel, *Epp. Rom. Pont.* i. 517); *Chron. Z. M.* v. 7.

² Text in Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 14 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2619 sqq.); Liberatus, *Brev.* xvii (*P. L.* lxxviii. 1023 sqq.); *Chron. Z. M.* v. 8; tr. in J. C. Ayer, *Source-Book*, 527-9: see also Fleury, xxix. liii; Hefele, iii. 452.

³ Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 13 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2620).

⁴ *Ibid.* 14 (2621 c).

⁵ *Ibid.* 14 (2624 c).

⁶ Denny, *Papalism*, §§ 800, 922 sqq.

CHAPTER XXI

THE CHURCHES BEYOND THE EMPIRE

THE contrast between the Christianity of Rome and Persia brings us to a review of the churches to the east of the Empire,¹ specially as affected by the decisions taken at the Council of Chalcedon. They are the churches of Georgia; Armenia; Persia; 'Arabia', 'India', and Abyssinia.

I. Georgia.²

§ 1. Greek colonies³ had long existed on either side of the straits which separate the eastern shore of the Crimea from the mainland: Bosphorus, or Panticapaeum on the west, and Phanagoria opposite. Following the seaboard, across the Caucasus, a traveller would have come to three other Greek colonies on the north-east coast of the Black Sea, Nicopsis, now Tuapse,⁴ in Zichia,⁵ just under the mountain range; Pityus, now Pitsunda; and Dioscurias, now Sukhum. The two latter belonged to the province of Pontus Polimoniacus⁶; and lay within the Roman Empire. At an early date Christianity was represented in some of these cities; though later in others. Thus Bosphorus⁷ and Pityus⁸ each sent a bishop to the Council of Nicaea; while at Phanagoria, Nicopsis, and Dioscurias bishoprics date only from the days of Anastasius, 519–†27, or Justinian,⁹ 527–†65. South of Dioscurias, known in the time of Justinian as Sepastopolis, lay

¹ L. Duchesne, *The churches separated from Rome*; A. Fortescue, *The lesser eastern churches* ([Roman] Catholic Truth Society, 1913).

² See *Description géographique de la Géorgie*, par le Tsarévitch Wakhoucht; Georgian text of eighteenth century, with tr. into French by M. F. Brosset (Pétersbourg, 1842).

³ Map in H. Kiepert, *Forma orbis antiqui*, No. x.

⁴ There stood here in the eighteenth century the great church of Bidchwinta, built by Justinian, Brosset, 407.

⁵ For this region, see M. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1325 sq.; J. E. T. Wiltsh, *Geography and statistics of the Church*, i. 187 (1859).

⁶ Le Quien, i. 499 sqq.; Wiltsh, i. 160, 441 sq.

⁷ C. H. Turner, *Eccl. Occ. Mon. Iur. Ant.* i. i [No. 218], p. 90.

⁸ Ibid. i. i [No. 114], p. 62.

⁹ Le Quien, i. 1327 sq., 1357; Wiltsh, i. 187 sq.

Phasis,¹ now Poti, at the mouth of the Rion. That river flows north-west into the Black Sea, and, beyond the slight watershed whence it takes its rise, the Kura flows south-east into the Caspian. Together, these two river-valleys form the lowland situate between the Caucasus to the north and the highlands of Armenia to the south—a fertile region; and now of commercial importance as well, owing to the discovery of oil and its transport by the Transcaucasian railway, running from end to end of the country between Baku on the Caspian and Batum on the Black Sea. Along this valley lay three territories: Colchis on the Black Sea and Albania on the Caspian, and, between them, Iberia² (otherwise Georgia), round the modern Tiflis. West of Tiflis lay Mtskheta,³ its capital—the Canterbury of Georgia. Tiflis itself was built in 455 and became the capital; and the ecclesiastical ruler of Georgia thenceforward came to be known as the *Catholicus* of Tiflis. The dynasty of the country was of Iranian extraction; and its fortunes, like those of its greater neighbour, Armenia, were continually a prey to the rivalry of the Roman and Persian Empires which hemmed it in.

§ 2. It was in the time of Constantine that Georgia became Christian,⁴ 332.⁵ Nina, a Christian captive, lived near the royal city, and made a profound impression upon all with whom she came into contact by her devout life. They brought her a sick child, whose recovery she obtained by her prayers. The news was carried to Queen Nana, when she fell ill; and Nina procured the like benefit for her. The Queen succeeded, at last, in persuading her husband to join her in becoming a Christian. They built a church, and sent to Constantine for bishops and clergy. Such was the story of Mirian (so named in legend), the first Christian king of Georgia, as told to Rufinus,⁶ †410, by a second king of Georgia, Bacurius, who afterwards became Count of the Domestics under Theodosius I and was killed⁷ at the Battle of the Frigidus, 394. A third prince of that house was Nabarnougi, better known

¹ Le Quien, i. 1343; Wiltsch, i. 187, 461.

² Le Quien, i. 1333 sq.; Wiltsch, i. 244.

³ O. Wardrop, *The kingdom of Georgia*, 39 (1888).

⁴ T. E. Dowling, *Sketches of Georgian Church History* (S.P.C.K. 1912).

⁵ For this date, see 'The life of St. Nino', by M. and J. O. Wardrop in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, v. i (1890).

⁶ Rufinus, *H. E.* i. x (*Op.* 233-6; *P. L.* xxi. 480-2); Socrates, *H. E.* i. xx; Sozomen, *H. E.* ii. vii.

⁷ Zosimus, *Hist.* iv. 57 sq.; Socr. *H. E.* v. xxv, § 13.

as Peter the Iberian.¹ When twelve years old he was sent as a hostage to Theodosius II, where he edified the Court by his piety.² About 420 he withdrew to Jerusalem, where he was welcomed by Melania the younger who had seen him at Constantinople; and he received the monastic habit at the hands of the Monophysite abbot, Gerontius. He then set up a community of his own at the Tower of David; and ruled it in peace till the arrival of the Empress Eudocia. She had known him, at Constantinople, as Master of the Horse; and she now so plagued him with her visits that, in self-defence, he took flight to Gaza, and there practised his rule, till he was again disturbed by ordination to the priesthood against his will, 447. He was afterwards consecrated bishop of Maiuma in Palestine I by Theodosius,³ the intruding Patriarch of Jerusalem; and was one of the two prelates who consecrated Timothy the Cat.⁴ The church of Georgia, till the end of the sixth century,⁵ depended on the *Catholicus* of Armenia, as he in his turn had depended upon the Exarch of Caesarea in Cappadocia. But the connexion ceased in 609 when Kyrion I, the *Catholicus* of Georgia, who accepted Chalcedon with a view, no doubt, to Byzantine favour, seceded; and was excommunicated by the Armenian Patriarch, Abraham I, at the Synod of Dvin.⁶ From that day forward the Church of Georgia, while continuing orthodox, became independent. Its orthodoxy remains; but in 1811 its independence was abolished, and the Georgian Church was absorbed by Russia.⁷ For a hundred years everything in Georgia was Russianized: hierarchy and clergy, liturgy and language; the Exarch himself and the bishops of Georgia being recruited from among the Russian clergy.⁸ But, after the Russian revolution of 1917, a Georgian National Congress met in Tiflis, 17 September, and elected archbishop Kyrion II as *Catholicus*—Patriarch of Georgia. He had suffered much for his patriotism from the Russian Government. He was consecrated,

¹ His biography was written by Zacharias of Mitylene, and by another author whose work is preserved for us in a Syriac version of the sixth century; for whom, see Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 457, 469 nn.

² *Chron. Z. M.* iii, § 4.

³ *Chron. Z. M.* iii, § 4; Evagrius, *H. E.* ii, § 5 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2513 B).

⁴ Evagrius, *H. E.* ii, § 8 (*P. G.* lxxxvi. 2521 B); *Chron. Z. M.* iv, § 1.

⁵ Or, till the end of the fifth, on the see of Antioch, *St. Bibl.* v. i. 5.

⁶ M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia*, 40 sq.; A. Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 413 sq.

⁷ Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 304 sq.

⁸ Ormanian, 41.

19 October 1917, in the ancient Cathedral of Mtzkhet'ha ; and is now at the head of a national church which has regained its independence.

II. Armenia.

South of Georgia lay Armenia,¹ in the highlands drained by the upper waters of the Euphrates to the West, of the Tigris to the south, and by the Araxes and its tributary the Kura to the north.

§ 3. The capital of Armenia, from the end of the second century, was Valarshapat (now Etchmiadzin) in the valley of the Araxes (now the Aras), 'not far from Erivan, at the northern base of Mt. Ararat'. Since Lucullus had taken its former capital, Tigranocerta, 69 B.C., the country had been considered to be part of the Roman Empire. But it was governed by native princes: Tigranes I, 90–†55 B.C., for instance, who was recognized, 66 B.C., as king of Armenia when he broke with his father-in-law, Mithridates, towards the end of the third Mithridatic War. The Armenian princes were, as often as not, related to, or in alliance with, the Arsacidae, 244 B.C.–A.D. 226, who were kings of Parthia. Hellenism, therefore, had little attraction for the Armenians: nor was their allegiance to be won for the Republic by its garrisons on their borders—Ziata (now Kharput) on the Eastern Euphrates, and Gorneae (now Garni) on the Western Euphrates. All their sympathies looked towards the Parthians. Thus Armenia became involved, as a frontier state, between the empires of Rome and Parthia with an inclination towards the Parthians when, in A.D. 165, the Romans established themselves in the great fortress of Nisibis,² just across the southern border. The absorption of Osrhoene, with its capital, Edessa (now Urfa), in A.D. 195, by the arms of Septimius Severus, 193–†211, consolidated this advance. Thirty years later the Parthian Empire passed into the hands of the Sassanidae,³ A.D. 226–632—a new and vigorous dynasty from

¹ H. Kiepert, *Forma orbis antiqui*, maps 5, 33, 34 ; and, for 'the sources and chronology of Armenian history', Bury's *Gibbon*, ii, app. 18.

² Nisibis was given up by the Parthians to the Armenians, B. C. 149 ; stormed by Lucullus, 68 ; taken by Trajan, A. D. 116 ; given up by Hadrian, 117 ; reconquered by Lucius Verus, 165 ; taken by the Persian king, Sapor I, 258 (*Gibbon*, c. x [i. 269]) ; recovered by Odenathus, 261 ; besieged by Sapor II, thrice, 338, 346, 350 ; abandoned to Persia by Jovian, 363 (*ibid.*, c. xxiv [ii. 521]).

³ *Gibbon*, c. viii (i. 196 sqq.).

Persia. The Armenians, as friends of the dethroned Arsacidae, found themselves entangled in wars with the Persians. Moreover, these were wars of religion ; for, unlike the Parthians, the Persians were ardent propagandists¹ of their religion, and were bent on seeing Mazdaism dominant in Armenia. But Persia suffered a check, 261, from Odenathus,² king of Palmyra. He recovered the prestige of the Roman Empire in the East, and restored the fortunes of its allies. The victories of Carus,³ 283, and of Galerius,⁴ 297, completed the recovery ; and Armenia, under its king, Tiridates,⁵ 261–†317, entered once more into the orbit of Rome, 298. A treaty was signed,⁶ 314, between Tiridates and Constantine, to whom the next two kings of Armenia, Chosroes II, 317–†26, the founder of the royal residence at Dvin,⁷ and Tiran, 326–†37, owed their elevation ; for ‘ Armenia was attached to the Empire by the double ties of policy and religion ’.⁸ But for thirty years after the death of Constantine, Arsaces, 337–†67, occupied the throne of Armenia, and made it his policy to hold the balance between the Roman and the Persian Empire during the wars of Constantius and Julian.⁹ On the defeat of Julian, Jovian concluded with Sapor II the treaty of Dura,¹⁰ July 363, with the result that the Romans withdrew their frontier west of Nisibis and abandoned their protectorate over Armenia. The Persians at once occupied it, murdered its king, Arsaces, and turned the country into a Persian province.¹¹ Restive under these consequences of their withdrawal, the Romans endeavoured to regain by intrigue their losses in the field ; and Valens, 364–†78, set up Pap,¹² the son of Arsaces, as king of Armenia, 367–†74. He had a precarious tenure, for he was opposed by the nobles and the clergy ; and, after his assassination,¹³ Armenia continued to be the scene of the rivalries between Rome and Persia till, at last, neither side could put up with it any longer. In 387 Theodosius I and Artaxerxes II agreed upon a partition of the country¹⁴ ; and,

¹ Gibbon, c. viii (i. 203).

² Ibid., c. x (i. 272).

³ Ibid., c. xii (i. 340).

⁴ Ibid., c. xiii (i. 375).

⁵ S. Weber, *Die Katholische Kirche in Armenien*, 104 sqq. (1903).

⁶ Gibbon, ii, app. 18, § 3 (ed. Bury).

⁷ Weber, 237.

⁸ Gibbon, c. xviii (ii. 226).

⁹ Gibbon, vol. ii, app. 18, § 3 (ed. Bury) ; Weber, 240 sqq.

¹⁰ Gibbon, c. xxiv (ii. 520).

¹¹ Ibid., c. xxv (iii. 53).

¹² Amm. Marc. xxvii. xii, §§ 9, 10 ; Weber, 257.

¹³ Amm. Marc. xxx. i, §§ 1, 21 ; Faustus Byzantinus, *Hist. Arm.* v. 32 (V. Langlois, *Collections*, i. 295).

¹⁴ Gibbon places the partition in the fifth century (c. xxxii [iii. 392]) ; but see app. 25, where Bury gives the date, 387.

while Rome retained a fifth of the whole with Theodosiopolis (now Erzerum, or 'Arx Romanorum') for its capital, the remaining four-fifths were assigned to Persia.¹ Nominal kings, of Armenian lineage, ruled as Persian vassals till 428; then marzbans,² or governors of the frontiers, administered the country, some of them Armenians.

Such is the political history of Armenia. We have now to trace its religious history³: through the stages of (1) conversion, mainly from Caesarea in Cappadocia, (2) the breach with Caesarea, and (3) autonomy.

§ 4. And, first, conversion. Maximin, 311-†13, as we are told by Eusebius, attempted to force the Armenians to sacrifice to idols. They were Christians already, and 'allies of the Romans'.⁴ Probably they belonged to the south-west portion of Greater Armenia called Sophene, which Diocletian in 297 had annexed to the Empire, though he allowed it to be governed by native chiefs. They, or their fellow-countrymen in Lesser Armenia,⁵ had had Christians among them a generation earlier; for Meruzanes is mentioned as bishop of the Armenians at the time when Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria 247-†65, wrote to them on the subject of penance.⁶ The country on either side of the border may well have owed its knowledge of the Gospel to no organized effort at first, but to traders. Be this so or not, the Christianization of the kingdom of Armenia received a powerful impetus under its sovereign, Tiridates I,⁷ 261-†317. His agent in the conversion

¹ Weber, 271 sq.

² Ibid. 385.

³ The authorities are collected in V. Langlois, *Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie* (2 vols., Paris, 1867-9). They are (1) Faustus Byzantinus, a native Armenian of the fourth century, who wrote in Greek, and gives, in Books iii-vi, the story of the conversion of Armenia and the history of the Armenian Church down to the division of the country between Rome and Persia in 387. He is 'our only trustworthy source for Armenian history after 317'; and (2) Agathangelus, an Armenian writer of the fifth century, and our only good source for the reign of Tiridates, 261-†317 (so Bury's Gibbon, ii. 563 sq., app. 18). For modern works, see E. F. K. Fortescue, *The Church in Armenia* (1872); T. E. Dowling, *The Armenian Church* (1910); M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia* (1912) [all three descriptive, with some historical matter; 'the weakest side' of Ormanian being 'the historical', according to F. C. Conybeare in *J. T. S.* xv. 471 sq.]; A. Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 395 sqq.; H. Gelzer, 'Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche' in *Berichte der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Phil.-Hist. Classe, 1895, I, II, pp. 109 sqq.; S. Weber, *Die Katholische Kirche in Armenien* (1903).

⁴ Eus. *H. E.* ix. viii, § 2.

⁵ Bury thinks that Meruzanes was bishop in Greater Armenia, Gibbon, i. 565.

⁶ Eus. *H. E.* vi. xlvi, § 2.

⁷ Soz. *H. E.* ii. viii, § 1.

of his country was St. Gregory the Illuminator; himself an Armenian prince who had fled, during the Persian occupation, to Caesarea in Cappadocia. Here he was converted to Christianity, and received a Christian and a Greek education; and here, at the request of Tiridates, he obtained from archbishop Leontius¹ consecration to the episcopate, 302, and became the apostle of Armenia. For Tiridates had decided to change the religion of his country; and it was an official conversion over which he summoned Gregory, as bishop, to preside. The Persians were ardent propagandists of their religion in Armenia, by way of expanding their political influence there. To this propaganda, subversive of Armenian nationality, the ancient Armenian paganism was incapable of offering adequate resistance; and thus, to oppose the peril of Mazdaism by an enthusiasm greater than its own, Tiridates determined to adopt the Christian religion, already so powerful over his borders both in Asia Minor and in Syria. It was tolerated at that time and likely, as the king may have perceived, to become dominant in the Empire, now friend and protector to Armenia. He took it over; and, from that day forward, for Armenians their nation and their religion have been preserved together. The neighbouring churches supplied Armenia with teachers. From the West, i.e. from Lesser Armenia and Cappadocia, came Greek-speaking clergy and catechists; while Armenia owed as much—perhaps even before the mission of Gregory²—to missionaries of the Syriac tongue from Edessa and Nisibis, who penetrated the country from the south. As yet, the Armenian language was spoken only, and not written: so up to the middle of the fifth century the Armenians used the Byzantine rite in Greek, or the Antiochene in Syriac³; and Faustus Byzantinus even says that true Christianity was limited to those who could read Greek or Syriac.⁴ As to religious organization, the Church simply took over, as did the parish in England,⁵ the arrangements existing for the support of the ancient cults. Temples, with their endowments, which were considerable, became churches; their priests became Christian clergy; and, at the head of the hierarchy, Gregory was installed as *Catholicus*

¹ *D. C. B.* iii. 687.

² Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 535, n. 1.

³ Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 409, n. 2.

⁴ Faust. Byz. iii, § 13 (Langlois, i. 223).

⁵ So E. W. Watson, s.v. 'Parish' in S. L. Ollard and G. Crosse, *Dict. Engl. Ch. Hist.* 442.

in a hereditary high-priesthood (one, among other touches of Judaism¹ in the Armenian Church) which for five generations continued in his family, till 439. The title originally meant 'administrator', 'procurator', or 'Vicar-General',² and implied, as was at first the case, that the Church of Armenia was dependent upon the see of Caesarea. But the wealth and dignity of these hereditary pontiffs brought them into rivalry with the kings; and this rivalry issued, about the time of St. Basil, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia 370-†9, in independence.

§ 5. The breach with Caesarea took place about 374. Gregory had two sons.³ The younger, Aristaces, represented his father at the Council of Nicaea,⁴ and succeeded him as *Catholicus*, 325-†33. He was followed in that eminence by his elder brother, Vertanes,⁵ 333-†41; who, after setting his elder son Gregory over the Church of Georgia, bequeathed his own dignity to the younger, Houssik,⁶ the fourth *Catholicus*, 341-†7. Houssik had occasion to remonstrate with king Tiran II for the immoralities of his Court; and he paid for his boldness by a martyr's death.⁷ His sons preferred to take no such risks. Indeed, they gave themselves up to pleasure like other young nobles, and were, happily, refused the Catholicate.⁸ For a time it passed out of the line of direct descent to Paren,⁹ 348-†52, and another¹⁰ who were content to wink at abuses. But no sooner had it reverted to Nerses,¹¹ 353-†73, the grandson of Houssik, than the rivalry between the priestly and the royal dynasty took a fresh lease of life. Nerses, through his mother, was nephew of king Tiran. He had been brought up at Caesarea.¹² On returning to the Court of Armenia, he occupied a place of trust about the person of king Arsaces, 337-†67. The nobles acclaimed him as *Catholicus*.¹³ They conducted him to Caesarea for consecration by the exarch Eusebius, 362-†70; and Basil took part in the function.¹⁴ Nerses could not

¹ Gelzer, 140 sq.

² M. le Quien, *Oriens Chr.* i. 164.

³ For these dates see Ormanian, 230 sqq.; but they are uncertain, and do not tally with the dates of the kings as given in Bury's Gibbon, ii. app. 18.

⁴ Faustus, iii, § 2 (Langlois, i. 210 sq.).

⁵ Ibid. iii, § 3 (Langlois, i. 211 sq.).

⁶ Ibid. iii, §§ 5, 6 (Langlois, i. 213 sq.).

⁷ Ibid. iii, § 12 (Langlois, i. 221).

⁸ Ibid. iii, §§ 13, 15, 19 (Langlois, i. 224-9); Gelzer, 143, 50.

⁹ Faustus, iii, § 16 (Langlois, i. 227).

¹⁰ Ibid. iii, § 17 (Langlois, i. 228).

¹¹ Ibid. iii, § 19 (Langlois, i. 229).

¹² Gelzer, 151.

¹³ Faustus, iv, § 3 (L. i. 236 sq.).

¹⁴ Ibid. iv, § 4 (L. i. 238).

but contrast the austere religion he had learned to value there with the paganism, veiled under Christian forms, which satisfied the ideals of Armenia. In 365 he summoned a Synod¹ at Ashtishat, the seat of the Catholicate so long as the connexion with Caesarea continued, and instituted reforms. They aimed at securing the indissolubility of marriage; the abolition of heathenish customs at funerals; the observance of the Religious Life and, by the clergy, of a higher standard; the provision of new bishoprics and of hospices for sick and poor; the suppression of vagabondage and the promotion of education, by the foundation of schools for Greek and Syriac. It was an enlightened programme; and Nerses was supported, at first, by public opinion. But, at length, he encountered the hostility of the Court²; and Arsaces set up a rival *Catholicus*, Tchonak³ by name, and had him consecrated by two fugitive bishops dependent upon himself, in spite of the rights of Caesarea to consecrate the *Catholicus* of Armenia. In 367, however, the king was made prisoner by the Persians⁴; and Nerses, for a time, could pursue his reforms in peace.⁵ He became Lord Protector to Pap, the young son of Arsaces, whom Valens set up, as we have seen, and maintained upon the throne.⁶ But the young prince, when he came of age, claimed his liberty for a life of licence⁷; and, when Nerses remonstrated, the king had him poisoned at a banquet.⁸ The death of the *Catholicus*, 373, was the signal for a reaction; nationalist, anti-clerical, and, in effect, anti-Christian too. Pap quashed the reforms of Nerses, and withdrew the endowments which Tiridates had bestowed upon the Church.⁹ The people, encouraged by the revulsion of feeling at Court, again set up the altars of the gods. The king then appointed as *Catholicus* Houssik, 373-†7, of the family of Albianus, a rival house to that of Gregory,¹⁰ and had him consecrated at home. But he had not decided to break finally with Caesarea. He sent Faustus thither for consecration to an Armenian See;

¹ Faustus, iv, § 4 (L. i. 239 sq.), and Document No. 118. Ashtishat was in Taron in the south of Armenia. In the fourth century it was the ecclesiastical capital of the country (Gelzer, 127), and the place for Synods (ibid. 131). In the fifth century the Catholicate was removed to Dvin, 484-931; and in 1441 to Etchmiadzin (the ancient Valarshapat), which is now the centre of the Armenian Church.

² Ibid. iv, §§ 13, 15 (L. i. 248 sqq.).

³ Ibid. iv, § 15 (L. i. 254); Gelzer, 155.

⁴ Ibid. iv, § 54 (L. i. 269 sqq.).

⁵ Ibid. v, § 21 (L. i. 289).

⁶ Ibid. v, § 1 (L. i. 278 sq.).

⁷ Ibid. v, § 22 (L. i. 289 sq.).

⁸ Ibid. v, § 23 (L. i. 290).

⁹ Ibid. v, § 31 (L. i. 294 sq.); Gelzer, 156.

¹⁰ Ibid. v, § 29 (L. i. 293); Gelzer, 157.

but Basil decided against him, on finding that he belonged to the Court—or ‘schismatical’—party, and gave the See to Cyril. Faustus thereupon went off to Basil’s rival, Anthimus, bishop of Tyana and metropolitan of Cappadocia II, and procured consecration from him.¹ Clearly Armenia could do without Caesarea; and hence the breach. Basil took measures, in the case of the *Catholicus*, to uphold the prerogative of his See²; and was supported in so doing both by the Emperor Valens and by the older clergy of Armenia who clung to the House of Gregory. But his claims were ignored; and from this time forward the consecration of the *Catholicus* of Armenia was lost to Caesarea.

§ 6. The Church of Armenia thus entered upon its career of autonomy. In 385 died Manuel the Mamikonian, regent 378–85, for the last king of an independent Armenia.³ His death led at once to the partition of the country between Rome and Persia.⁴ In Greater Armenia (Persarmenia) two perils in succession assailed the Church: first, persecution; and then, heresy.

(1) The persecution, directed by the Persians toward the breaking down of Armenian nationality, met with a manful resistance. Sahak (Isaac), who succeeded Nerses his grandfather as *Catholicus*, 387–†439, became, like the Jewish High Priest on the overthrow of the monarchy, the rallying-point of every patriotic interest, Christian or nationalist.⁵ Discipline and education flourished under his rule. In collaboration with a disciple of Nerses, Mesrob⁶ by name, 354–†441, who in 404 invented the Armenian alphabet, the *Catholicus* provided his people with a national literature⁷ and with the means of worship in their mother-tongue. For, 404–33, translations of the Scriptures, from the Septuagint and the Syriac, appeared in the vernacular: ‘an event’, says Gibbon, ‘which relaxed the connexion of the Church and nation with Constantinople⁸.’ These translations were succeeded, from 433 onwards to the death of Sahak, by liturgical books in Armenian; though the Armenian Liturgy,⁹ while

¹ Basil, *Epp.* cxx–cxxii (*Op.* iv. 212–13; *P. L.* xxxii. 540–4); Gelzer, 159 sq.

² Faustus, v, § 29 (*L. i.* 293 sq.); Gelzer, 157.

³ Faustus, v, § 44 (*L. i.* 305); Gelzer, 105.

⁴ *Ibid.* vi. 1 (*L. i.* 307). At this point, Faust. Byz. ceases to be of interest and the authorities for the Catholicate of Sahak are (1) Gorioun, *Biographie de St. Mesrob*; (2) Élisée, *Histoire de la guerre des Arméniens*, both of the fifth century; and in V. Langlois, *Collections*, vol. ii.

⁵ Gelzer, 164.

⁶ *D. C. B.* iii. 908 sq.

⁷ Weber, § 17; Ormanian, c. vi.

⁸ Gibbon, c. xxxii, n. 83 (iii. 392).

⁹ F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies*, i. 412–57.

possessing peculiarities of its own,¹ e.g. the Old Testament Lesson and the unmixed chalice, is really a variant of the Byzantine rite,² derived not from Constantinople but from Caesarea in Cappadocia where the Byzantine rite was first formed.³

(2) Heresy was the second peril to assail the Church of Armenia in the days of Sahak, and of his successor, Babken I, 490–†519.

In its first form, of Nestorianism, the assault was speedily repelled. No sooner were the works of Diodore and Theodore circulated in Armenia, than Sahak and the Armenian bishops, warned by Rabbûla, bishop of Edessa, and Acacius, bishop of Melitene and metropolitan of Armenia II, held a Synod at Ashtishat, 435, which condemned the writings in question and sought to elicit support from the See of Constantinople. The celebrated doctrinal epistle, or *Tome*, of Proclus was received by them in reply; and, in accepting it, the Armenians preserved their orthodoxy free of all taint of Nestorianism.

They were not so happy in avoiding the second infection of Monophysitism. The Council of Chalcedon had been held while the Armenians were face to face with an effort on the part of Jazdegerd II, 438–†57, the king of Persia, to enforce Mazdaism by edict,⁴ 449, on all his subjects and to crush out Christianity in Armenia. During this struggle the Emperor Marcian gave the Armenians no help; and naturally they felt no interest in his Council.⁵ Afterwards, when the Emperors went back upon the Council, the Armenians, by conciliating Imperial favour, might hope to throw off the Persian domination. After two revolts,⁶ 450–1 and 481–4, they secured religious liberty, at last, by 485, when their national hero, Vahan Mamigouni, became Governor-General of Armenia⁷ under the Persian king Balasch, 484–†8. Meanwhile, they entered upon a literary campaign against the decisions of Chalcedon; and, at the Synod of Valarshapat, 491, the *Catholicus* Babken I, 490–†515, condemned them in the

¹ A. Fortescue, *The Mass* ², 92 sq.; *L. E. C.* 441 sqq.

² Brightman, i, p. xvi.

³ Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 73 sq.

⁴ For the text of the edict, in the form of an invitation to embrace the worship of Ormazd, see Élisée, *Hist. d'Arménie*, c. ii (Langlois, ii. 190 sq.), and Document No. 210.

⁵ Lazare, *Hist. d'Arménie*, c. xx (Langlois, ii. 281).

⁶ The history of these two revolts was written by Lazare de Pharbe in the fifth century, and dedicated to Vahan Mamigouni; q.v. in Langlois, ii. 259 sqq.: see also Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 547; Ormanian, 30.

⁷ He took up his residence at Dvin, which also became the seat of the Catholicate, 484–931.

presence of Armenian, Georgian, and Albanian bishops.¹ The condemnation was an echo of the *Henoticon* ; and a bid, no doubt, for the support of the Empire, under that instrument, officially Monophysite. The Empire went back upon that creed under Justin and Justinian, 519–65 ; but Armenia was only confirmed in it. For the Church in Persia, in order to secure its protection from the State, became Nestorian, *c.* 483–4, by way of assuring the Shah-in-Shah that its religion was *not* the religion of his enemies the Romans. But Armenia, which had suffered so much from Persia, if it looked in vain to the Roman Empire for protection, looked to Persia with dread. It was fear of, and antipathy to, Persia that weighed with Armenia far more than marching with the changing religious policies of successive Byzantine Emperors. Accordingly, the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon by the Synod of Valarshapat, 491, was confirmed in 527 and 551 by the Synods of Dvin² ; and, to the extent of such rejection, the Church of Armenia became Monophysite and so remains now. The Synods, however, repudiated Eutyches by name, as do Monophysites generally ; and as does every Armenian presbyter at his ordination to-day.³ But the Church of Armenia became Monophysite also by defect of the Armenian language. The whole question at Chalcedon turned on the difference between Person and Nature : whereas, for these two terms, an Armenian had only one word, *pnuthiun*.⁴ A Greek, therefore, might readily acknowledge one Person of Christ in two natures ; but, if an Armenian spoke of two *pnuthiunkh* [plural] in Him, that might be to confess himself a Nestorian. Now Nestorianism was the creed of Christians in Persia and Chalcedonianism the creed of Rome. The Persians had persecuted him and the Romans had deserted him, an Armenian would say ; there was not much to choose between their creeds : better the simpler and more straightforward belief, as expressed in his native tongue—‘ One Person . . . in one Nature united ’.⁵

¹ Ormanian, 351.

² For these dates, see Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 413, n. 1 ; but Ormanian gives Valarshapat, 506, and Dvin, 554, *Ch. Arm.* 35 sq.

³ At the ordination of a presbyter : ‘ *Deinde iubet magnus Vartaped : Opertet te, fili, detestari omnem sectam 159 haereticorum, et anathematizare proprio nomine omnes haereticorum ordines . . . Interrogat episcopus dicens : Anathematizas Eutychen, qui iustificationem per gratiam Christi negavit ?* ’ H. Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium*, ii. 302 sq. (Wirceburgi, 1863).

⁴ Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 412.

⁵ From the Armenian ‘ Confession of Faith ’ in T. E. Dowling, *The Armenian Church*, 65 : see also Ormanian, 107.

III. Persia.

§ 7. Of the Church in Persia¹; its persecution under Sapor II,² 309–†79, and Bahram V, 420–†38; and its proclamation first of its independence, 424, and then of its Dyophysitism, 484, to distinguish itself from the Churches of the Empire³ and so obtain toleration from the kings of Persia, enough has been said.

IV. 'Arabia', 'India', and Abyssinia.

We pass, in conclusion, to the churches of 'Arabia', 'India', and Abyssinia.⁴ Between Syria and Mesopotamia, each the seat of a settled population, belonging on the West to the Roman Empire and on the East to the Persian, lay deserts inhabited only by nomads. These deserts constituted 'Arabia', from their northern limit to the Sinaitic peninsula; and, further still, to the outlets of the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. From these shores onwards lay the districts vaguely called 'India' by the ancients. None of the tribes offered much of a field to Christian missions.

§ 8. But in 'Arabia' some Christian influences were exercised at scattered points by the ascetics.⁵ They had also become, by the fourth century, children, though not natives, of the desert. Thus Hilarion, 300–†71, who lived as a hermit near Gaza, gathered disciples round him⁶; and Sozomen tells us of a solitary in the days of Valens, 364–†78, who converted a sheik named Zokom. The sheik had no heir; and laid his grief open to the solitary, who prayed for him and promised that, if he would believe on Jesus Christ, he should have a son. The heir was born to him; and Zokom and all his tribesmen became Christians.⁷ Mavia, also, a queen of the 'Saracens', was involved in war with the Romans during the reign of Valens; and would only make peace on condition that a bishop should be sent to her tribe and that her bishop should be a solitary named Moses, whom she held in high esteem. Valens consented, 375; and Moses was presented for consecration to Lucius, the Arian intruder at Alexandria.

¹ J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse* (1904); Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 547 sqq.; Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 38 sqq.

² Vol. ii, c. iv.

³ Vol. iii, c. xiii.

⁴ Duchesne, *Hist. anc.* iii. 571 sqq.; *The Churches separated from Rome*, 180 sqq.

⁵ Soz. *H. E.* vi. xxxviii, § 14.

⁶ Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis*, § 25 (*Op.* ii. 27; *P. L.* xxiii. 41 B, c); Soz. *H. E.* iii. xiv, § 41, vi. xxxii, § 6; *Vitae Patrum*, v. iv, § 15 (*P. L.* lxxiii. 568).

⁷ Soz. *H. E.* vi. xxxviii, §§ 14–16.

But Moses refused so tainted a source for his commission, and obtained consecration from Catholic bishops in exile.¹ Moses then, it would appear, converted an Arab tribe of the desert of Paran, or Mt. Sinai, in Palestina Salutaris, under its chief, Obedian.² Thence arose the bishopric of Paran,³ at the oasis of that name; a see that afterwards took its title from the celebrated monastery of St. Catherine⁴ in the peninsula of Sinai.

Other sees, of a similar type, sprang up on the Eastern borders of Palestine and Phoenicia, such as that of Parembolae, or the Camps,⁵ whose first bishop was the sheik Aspebetus.⁶ He went over to the Faith because his paralytic son was healed⁷ by Euthymius, †473, an ascetic near Jericho. He was baptized⁸ by Juvenal, Patriarch of Jerusalem 418–†58, under the name of Peter, and then consecrated⁹ by him to be bishop of the Saracens. As such he figured at the Council of Ephesus, 431.¹⁰ Probably these were tribal bishoprics; and, on this account, failed to unite themselves into a national church, as did their neighbours in Armenia and Persia. Room was found for them instead in the hierarchical system of the Church of the Empire.

§ 9. To the south of 'Arabia' lay the districts vaguely called 'India', between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. These shores were tenanted by populations organized not tribally but in settled communities; for they made their livelihood not as nomads but by commerce. On the East coast of the Red Sea, towards Aden, in Arabia Felix, now Yemen, lay the kingdom of Himyar (Homer¹¹). On the African coast, opposite, was situate in what is now the Italian protectorate of Eritrea, the port of Adulis; and, behind it, Abyssinia with its capital, Axum. Jewish influence dominated Yemen; and so to this region may have belonged the 'Indians' among whom, c. 200, Pantaenus found 'the Gospel according to Matthew in the Hebrew language'.¹² But neither of that Gospel nor of the 'Indians' nor of the success

¹ Rufinus, *H. E.* ii, § 6 (*Op.* 276; *P. L.* xxi. 515); Soer. *H. E.* iv. xxxvi; Soz. *H. E.* vi. xxxviii, §§ 1–14; Thdt. *H. E.* iv. xxiii; Tillemont, *Mém.* vii. 593–7.

² F. Combefis, *Illustr. mart. triumph.* 99 sqq. (Parisii, 1660).

³ M. Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* iii. 751; Wiltsh, i. 225.

⁴ Wiltsh, i. 226.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 225; and note in Fleury, iii. 28. This see was also in Palestina Salutaris.

⁶ Fleury, xxv. xiv, xxxiv, xxxvi, xxviii. xxxvi.

⁷ Cyril of Scythopolis [c. 510–†60], *Vita Euthymii* in *Analecta Graeca*, i, p. 19 (Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1688); Bardenhewer, 558.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹¹ Cosmos Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, iii. 179 (*P. G.* lxxxviii. 169 c).

¹² Eus. *H. E.* v. x, § 3

that attended the labours of Pantaenus among them have we further information.

§ 10. More information has survived of the beginnings of Christianity in 'Ethiopia' or Abyssinia.¹

In all probability, it is to the 'Golden Decade' of Athanasius, 346-56, that there belongs² the story of Frumentius and Aedesius, the first missionaries to Abyssinia, as told by Rufinus.³ He heard it, as he is careful to note, from the lips of Aedesius himself, then a priest at Tyre.⁴ Athanasius consecrated Frumentius to be bishop of Axum; and hence the founding of the national Church of Abyssinia, whose Matran, or metropolitan, is still consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria. 'His proper jurisdiction', says Neale, 'is that of a metropolitan, but there are some peculiar limits to his power. He is never a native of Abyssinia, but an Egyptian. His nomination and consecration rests with the bishop of Alexandria alone; and he has the right of consecrating bishops, so that the whole number in his province does not exceed seven. This, as the event proved, was a most unwise regulation. It was, apparently, adopted at first by the jealousy of Alexandria, lest Axum should constitute itself a patriarchate. As twelve bishops were canonically required for the consecration of a patriarch, the limitation to seven entirely obviated this danger. But it has caused two great evils. It has prevented the spread of the Gospel in Africa. And [it] has been the occasion of the [Monophysite] heresy in the Abyssinian Church.'⁵

Athanasius, however, could scarcely have foreseen the evils that would follow upon a precedent created out of a sense of the sanctity of his name. The mission of Frumentius, successful as it proved and emanating from Athanasius, attracted the suspicions of the Emperor Constantius. He was alarmed at this extension of the influence of the man whom he most feared in his Empire. Accordingly, he wrote⁶ to Aizanas and Sazanas,

¹ J. M. Neale, *Patr. Al.* i. 156 sqq.; *D. C. B.* ii. 232 sqq.; Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 293; and, for the Ethiopic Liturgy, Brightman, i. 194-244, and S. A. B. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Liturgy* (Milwaukee, 1915). It is 'fundamentally identical with the Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril', i. e. with 'the most ancient text' at our disposal for studying the Alexandrine rites, Duchesne, *Chr. Worship* ⁵, 81.

² For this date, see Gwatkin, *Arianism* ², 97-9.

³ Rufinus, *H. E.* i, § 9 (*Op.* 230-2; *P. L.* xxi. 478 sqq.); Socr. *H. E.* i. xix; Soz. *H. E.* ii. xxiv; Thdt. *H. E.* i. xxii.

⁴ Rufinus, *H. E.* i, § 9 (*Op.* 232; *P. L.* xxi. 480 A). ⁵ *Patr. Al.* i. 156.

⁶ *Ath. Apol. ad Const.*, § 31 (*Op.* i. 250; *P. G.* xxv. 636 sq.).

two princes of Axum, and bade them send Frumentius to be better instructed by George, the intruding Arian bishop at Alexandria. The bearer of this letter was Theophilus the Indian.¹ Theophilus had come, as an hostage, from Ceylon in the days of Constantine. He was educated by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and developed into a thorough-going Arian. By curing the Empress Eusebia of a malady, he earned the gratitude of Constantius ; and, after being consecrated bishop, 356, was dispatched by him with the document demanding the recall of Frumentius. Visiting the kingdom of Himyar, he attempted to convert its ruler, but met with opposition from the Jews. He succeeded, however, in procuring liberty of worship for Roman merchants residing there ; and built three churches, at Safar the capital, at Aden, and at Ormuz near the entrance to the Persian Gulf. There must, then, have been Christians on these distant shores. This done, for his missionary zeal was as ardent as his Arianism, Theophilus took the opportunity of crossing the Indian Ocean and paying a visit to his native island of Ceylon. There, as at other points in his journey, he found Christian congregations. Their faith differed nothing from his ; the only difference was that they *sat* during the reading of the Gospel. Cosmas Indicopleustes, a merchant of Alexandria, who, c. 520, made long voyages to India, Arabia, and East Africa, found Christians on the shores of India and in the island of Socotra.² They had settlements also on the Persian Gulf. In each of these regions they had bishops of their own, whose sees date, in the main, from the fifth century. They were colonists from the Church of Persia ; and a remnant of them still survives in the Christians of St. Thomas, on the Malabar Coast.³

¹ Greg. Nyss. *Adv. Eunomium*, i (*P. G.* xlv. 264 A) ; Philostorgius, *H. E.* iii, §§ 4-6, iv. §§ 1, 7, 8, v, § 4, vii, § 6, viii, § 2, ix, §§ 1, 3, 18 (*P. G.* lxxv. 481-90, 516 sq., 520 sq., 532 A, 544 A, 557 A, 568 A, 569 A, 584 A).

² *Top. Chr.* iii. 168 sq. (*P. G.* lxxxviii. 169) ; Labourt, 165, n. 6, 327.

³ Fortescue, *L. E. C.* 353 sqq.

INDEX

- 'Abdā, martyr in Persia, 420 ; 172 *n.*
 Abraham, a solitary of Auvergne, 372.
 Abundius, Bishop of Como, 450-†69 ; 312.
 Abyssinia, Church of, 427 sq. ; Liturgy of the, 428 *n.*
 Acacian Schism, 484-519 ; 399, 413.
 Acacius, Archbishop of Melitene, 431-†8 ; 215, 239, 242, 265 sq., 272, 424.
 Acacius, Bishop of Beroea, 381-†437 ; 174, 179, 221 sq., 250, 253, 257.
 Acacius, *Catholicus* of Persia, 485-95 ; 272.
 Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 471-†89 ; 398 sq., 406 sqq., 411 sqq.
 Accidie, 79 and *n.*
 Acoemetæ, The, 188, 409.
 Actors and actresses, tied to their trade, 366 *n.*
 Adam, created mortal, 70 and *n.* ; the first and the second, 76, 117, 125.
 Aden, Churches at, 429.
 'Adiutorium sine quo non fit' and 'quo fit', 122 *n.*, 137.
 'Adorable Divine Letter', The, 241.
 Adrumetum (Susa), 135 sqq.
 Aeonius, Archbishop of Arles, 493-†502 ; 158 sq.
 Aetius, Count of Italy, †454 ; 150, 278, 341 sq., 367.
 Affinity, a bar to marriage, 5.
 Africa, Donatism in, 11 sqq. ; Counts of, 12 *n.*, 25 *n.*, 150 ; Proconsul of, 13, 25 *n.* ; Vicar of, 13, 25 *n.* ; Roman exiles in, 45 sq. ; overrun by the Vandals, 150, 343 sqq., 374 sqq. ; seven provinces of, 344 sq. ; persecution in, 375 sqq. ; list of the Catholic episcopate of, 375 *n.* 2.
 Agathangelus (5 cent.), 419.
 Agricola, a Pelagianizing Briton, 139.
 Alans, The, 341.
 Alaric, King of the Visigoths, 395-†410 ; 17, 40 sqq., 341.
 Alban, St., 139.
 Albina, †431-2 ; 46, 115, 185 and *n.*
 Alexander, Archbishop of Antioch, 413-†21 ; 173 sqq., 248 sq.
 Alexander, Bishop of Apamea, 431-4 ; 240.
 Alexander, Bishop of Hierapolis, 431-4 ; 240, 255 sqq., 263 sq.
 Alexander, †430 ; founder of the Acoemetæ, 188, 255.
 Alexandria, authority of the see of, 51 sq., 180, 235 sq. ; Monophysite reaction in the patriarchate of, 402 sqq.
 'Alleluia', The, 377.
 Alleluia victory [430], The, 140.
 Altar, sometimes of wood, 14.
 Alypius, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, c. 458 ; 186.
 Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, 394-†429 ; 21, 33, 80, 130, 166, 184.
 Amator, Bishop of Auxerre, †418 ; 139, 350.
 Amphilochius, Bishop of Side, 426-†58 ; 185, 405.
 Amphitheatre, Callousness of the, 366.
 Amusements, Passion for, 45, 365.
 Anapsychia, the wife of Marcellinus, 84.
 Anastasius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 435-†51 ; 309, 315.
 Anastasius, Chaplain of Nestorius, 192, 201 sq.
 Anastasius, Emp., 491-†518 ; 414.
 Anastasius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 458-†78 ; 410.
 Anastasius, Pope, 399-†401 ; 4, 11, 56 sq.
 Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 449-†58 ; 309 sq., 312 sq., 315, 324 sqq., 332 sqq., 398, 403, 405 sq.
 Anatolius the Patrician, 308, 315.
 Andrew, Bishop of Samosata, 431-4 ; 232, 234 *n.*, 255 sqq., 263.
 Andronicus, Governor of the Pentapolis, 52 sq.
 'Ἀνδρωποτόκος, required to balance Θεοτόκος, 230.
 Anointing of the sick, The, 11.
 Anthemius, Bishop of Tyana, 423.

- Anthemius, Emp., 467-†72; 368, 382, 390.
- Anthemius, 408-14, minister of Theodosius II, 49; walls of, 49 n., 172.
- Anti-encyclical* of Basiliscus, The, 411.
- Antioch, schism of, 174; exegesis of, 187, 197, 233; Christology of, 193 sqq., 408; and Cyprus, 248 sq.; decline of the patriarchate of, 331 sq.; Monophysite reaction in patriarchate of, 408 sqq.
- Antony, Bishop of Fussala, 168.
- Antony, Bishop of Germa, 193.
- Antony, Bishop of Merida, 445-8; 373.
- Anysius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 383-†410; 4.
- Apiarius, Case of, 113, 162 sqq., 249.
- Apocrisiarii*, 210, 215, 412.
- Apollinarianism, 89, 179, 194, 262, 283 n., 408.
- Apostles' Creed, 248.
- Applause at sermons, 182, 204, 231, 260 sq.
- Apringius, Proconsul of Africa, 25.
- Aquileia, *Libellus Fidei* of the province of, 124.
- 'Arabia', The Church in, 426 sq.
- Arcadia, sister of Theodosius II, 49, 216.
- Arcadius, a bishop and papal legate at Ephesus, 237, 244.
- Arcadius, Emp., 395-†408; 50 sq.
- Archelaus, exarch of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 186.
- Ariadne, Empress, 398, 409.
- Arianism, at Constantinople, 50, 192, 404; at Antioch, 178; its doctrine of our Lord's Priesthood, 235 n.; among the Sueves, 374; in Africa, 377; in Rome, 385, 390.
- Aristaces, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 325-†33; 421.
- Aristolaus, tribune and notary, 256 sqq.
- Aristotelian dialectic, 123.
- Arles, growth of the See of, 353 sqq.
- Armenia, political history of, 417 sqq.; religious history of, 419 sqq.; authorities for, 419 n.; conversion of, 419; Church of, 272, 420; its breach with Caesarea in Cappadocia (374), 421 sq.; its autonomy, 423 sqq.; its persecution, 423 sq.; its heresy, 424 sq.; partition of the country between Rome and Persia (385), 272, 423; literature of, 423; liturgy of, 423 sq.
- Arnobius Junior, c. 440-54; 155 sq., 389 sq.
- Arsenius, 53.
- Asceticism, 39, 76 sq., 372, 400, 404.
- Asellus, a Roman presbyter and legate in Africa, 163.
- Aspar, The Patrician, †471; 397, 404.
- Ataulf, King of the Visigoths, 410-†15; 341.
- Atonement, Doctrine of the, 203.
- Attalus, Emp., 409-15; 43.
- Atticus, Bishop of Nicopolis, 446-†51; 317.
- Atticus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 406-†25; 50 sq., 104, 126, 132, 167, 170, 172 sq., 178 sq., 185, 212, 224.
- Attila, King of the Huns, †453; 313, 367, 380 sqq.
- Augustine, Archbishop of Aquileia, 407-†34; 124.
- Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, 396-†430; on the Donatist position, 12; on the Circumcellions, 14; on the use of force, 14, 16, 18; preaches at Carthage (411), 21; at the Conference of Carthage (411), 21 sqq.; on the Sermon on the Mount, 25; *Breviculus Collationis* (412), 26; *Ep. cxli* (412), 26; *Ad Donatistas post Collationem* (412), 26; *Sermo ad Caesarienses* (418), 27; *De gestis cum Emerito* (418), 27; *Contra Gaudentium* (420), 27 sq.; *De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus* (422-5), 28; *Enchiridion* (421), 28; in controversy with Manichaeans, 29 sqq.; *De actis cum Felice* (404), 29 sq.; *Contra ep. Manichaei* (396), 29; *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* (400), 31; *De natura boni* (404), 31; *Contra Secundinum* (405), 32; in controversy with Jerome, 32 sqq.; on the authority of Scripture, 33; *De Urbis excidio* (410), 44, 46; on the obligation of an oath, 46; *De civitate Dei* (413-26), 46 sq., 362; his theory of holiness, 54; on the character of Pelagius, 55, 81; *Confessions* of, 57; *Anti-Pelagian Writings* of, 59 n.; intervenes in the Pelagian controversy (412), 68; *De peccatorum meritis ac remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* (412), 69 sq.;

on Grace, 70, 81, 122, 135; as an interpreter of Scripture, 70 and *n.*, 72 *n.*, 121 sq., 122 *n.*, 141; *De gratia N.T.* (412), 71; *De Spiritu et littera* (412), 71 sq.; on Justification, 72 and *n.*; on free-will, 73; *De fide et operibus* (413), 73; *Sermo cccxiv* (413), 74 sq.; on infants dying unbaptized, 74, 86; and Cyprian, 75; on Counsels of Perfection, 76; on oaths, 76; letter to Juliana, 80; *De natura et gratia* (415), 80 sqq., 100, 103; denies salvation to the unbaptized, 81, 101, 129; on the inadequacy of Pelagianism, 81 sq.; on the immaculate conception of Mary, 82; *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (415), 82; *Ad Orosium* (415), 84; on the origin of the soul, 84 sq.; on Origen's universalism, 84; on the celestial hierarchy, 84; on Creationism and Traducianism, 85 *nn.* *De origine animae hominis* (415), 85 sq.; *De sententia Iacobi* (415), 86; his sense of humour, 91 *n.*; *De gestis Pelagii* (417), 92 sqq., 108; on Synod of Diospolis (415), 95 sq.; at Synod of Milevum (416), 99 sq.; letter to Pope Innocent I (416), 100; on 'merit', 101; his predestinarianism, 101, 120 sqq.; *De peccato originali* (418), 105, 116 sqq.; on the *Libellus Fidei* (418) of Pelagius, 107 sq.; at the Council of Carthage (1 May 418), 111 sq.; as commissary of Pope Zosimus, 114; *De gratia Christi* (418), 115 sq.; letter to Sixtus (418), 118 sqq., 134; typical statements of his predestinarianism, 120 *n.*; teaches a 'double' predestination, 121 *n.*, 128 *n.*; and Calvin, 121 *n.*, 122 and *n.*; his remorseless logic, 121; his overstatements, 122, 128, 133, 135 *n.*; on the Church and the Sacraments, 122 *n.*; allowances to be made for, 122, knew little Greek, 122 *n.*; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (419-20), 126 sq.; *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum* (422), 127 sq.; *Opus imperfectum* (429-30), 128, 149; criticism of his theology, 129; *Contra duas epp. Pel.* (420), 130 sqq.; his services to religion in the conflict with Pelagianism, 133;

De gratia et libero arbitrio (427), 135 sq.; on free-will, 135 and *n.*; *De correptione et gratia* (427), 136 sq.; on final perseverance, 136; and Leporius, 138; on Semi-Pelagianism, 140 sq., 146 sq.; how he differs from it, 144; *De praedestinatione sanctorum* (428-9), 144, 146 sq.; once a Semi-Pelagian, 146 sq.; *De dono perseverantiae* (428-9), 147 sqq.; *De haeresibus* (428), 149; on flight in persecution (428), 150 sq.; death of, 150, 345; services and influence of, 151 and *n.*; ever in communion with the Apostolic See, 153; at Council of Carthage (419), 167; and Antony Bishop of Fussala, 168; on our Lord's impeccability, 199 *n.*; invited to the Council of Ephesus (431), 230; letter to Honoratus, Bishop of Thiava (429), on the Vandal persecution, 375.

Augustinianism, 57 *n.*, 68 *n.*, 118 sqq., 122, 128, 133 sqq., 137, 141, 144 and *n.*, 151; modifications of, 151 sqq.; rejected by the Vincentian canon, 155; ruled out in Rome, 155 sqq.; at Council of Orange (529), 160 sq.

Aurelius, Archbishop of Carthage, 391-†430; 11, 20 sq., 65 sq., 73, 77, 99, 106, 109, 114, 124, 138, 150, 164, 166.

Ausonius, †388; 364.

Auspiciola, d. of Salvian, 361.

Authorities for the period, 50 sq., 145, 343 *n.*, 369, 399 *n.*, 400 *n.*, 419 *n.*, 423 *n.*, 424 *n.*, 428.

Auxiliaris, Prefect of Gaul, 359.

Avitus, Emp. 455-†6; 342 sq., 367 sq., 382.

Babken I, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 490-†519; 424.

Bacurius, Count of the Domestics, †494; 415.

Bahram V, King of Persia, 420-†38; 172 *n.*, 270.

Balasch, King of Persia, 484-†8; 424.

Baptism, minister of, 5, 290; Easter the time for, 5, 290; doctrine of, 112, 124, 264 sq.

Barbarian invaders, 364; invasions, 340 sqq.; enhance the authority of the Roman See, 374.

Barbarity of the fourth and fifth

- centuries, 122; its influence on Christian theology, 122 sq.
- Barsumas, †458, abbot; 302, 304, 307, 323.
- Barsumas, †492, Rector of the Persian School at Edessa, and Bishop of Nisibis, 271.
- Basil, an archimandrite of Constantinople; 202, 212 sq., 229.
- Basil, Bishop of Seleucia, 295, 305, 317.
- Basil, Patriarch of Antioch, 456-†8; 404 sq.
- Basiliscus, Emp., 475-7; 398, 406, 411.
- Bassa, Abbess, 401, 409.
- Bathanarius, Count of Africa, 401-†8; 12 and n., 16.
- Baths of Gargilius, The, 20 sq.
- Beronician, Bishop of Perga, 426-†31; 185.
- Besulas, a deacon of Carthage, 238, 249.
- 'Bishop of the Catholic Church', 390.
- Bishops, unity among, 5, 52 sq.; no clandestine consecration of, 6; not to be trusted to draw up forms of prayer, 17; administrators of justice, 25; qualifications of a bishop, 51; laymen not to be made bishops *per saltum*, 153; appointment of, 153; rivalries at the election of, 165, 168, 173, 180, 371 sq.; coercive jurisdiction of, 202; appointed from among ascetics in Gaul, 356, 368; or from among the wealthy, 368; day of a bishop, 371.
- Boniface I, Pope, 418-†32; 130, 132, 165, 167, 174.
- Boniface, Count of Africa, 422-†32; 149 sq., 345.
- Boniface, Papal legate at Chalcedon, 313.
- Bonosus, Bishop of Naïsus (Nish), 4 and n.
- Britain, abandoned by the Romans, 407; 41, 341, 349; Pelagianism in, 138 sqq., 347; degenerate Christianity of, 352.
- Burgundians, The, 342.
- Byzantine Court, Hostility to, 396, 403.
- Byzantinism, 302 sq., 325, 336.
- Caelestine, Pope, 422-†32; condemns Caelestius, 132 sq., 212; sends Germanus to Britain, 139, 347; and Palladius to Ireland, 139; and Prosper, 152; on the dress of the clergy in church (428), 152, 356; on Augustine, 153; death of, 154; and the case of Apiarius, 167 sqq.; asks Cyril for information about Nestorius, 211; experienced in administration, 218; deals with Nestorius, 219; his seven letters of 11 August (430), 223 sqq.; letter to Cyril (of 7 May 431), 237; his legates to Ephesus, 237; he forbids clergy to preach upon subtleties of doctrine, 356, 384.
- Caelestius, 57 sq.; *Contra traducem peccati*, 58; *Definitiones*, 58, 83, 86; denial of the Fall, 58; in Sicily, 65; in Africa, 65 sqq.; charges against, 66, 92, 94; excommunication of (417), 101; in Rome (417), 104; his confession of faith there, 105; exonerated by Pope Zosimus, 106; banished by Honorius (418), 111; denied original sin, 116; ejected from Italy and Constantinople, 133, 212; condemned at Ephesus (431), 133; an Irish Scot, 347.
- Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, 502-†42; 142, 158 sqq.
- Calandion, Patriarch of Antioch, 482-5; 410.
- Calpurnius, 349.
- Candidian, Count, 237, 240, 244.
- Canonical Books, 8.
- Capreolus, Archbishop of Carthage, 430-†5; 230 n., 238, 243.
- Carthage, Conference of (411), 19 sqq.; Capture of (439), 28, 374; wickedness of, 28 n.; numbers of the clergy of, 376; churches of, 376; revival of religion at, 376.
- Cassian, 360-†435; 138, 142 sq.; his *Institutes* (426), 143; his *Collations* (429), 143, 144; his Semi-Pelagianism, 143; *De incarnatione* (430-1), 152, 154, 174, 219; knew both Greek and Latin, 219.
- Castor, Bishop of Aptā Julia, 419-†28; 143.
- Catherine, Monastery of St., 427.
- Catholic doctrine; of the Church, 22 sq.; of the sacraments, 62 n.; of the work of Christ, 82.

- Catholicism, not opposed to Evangelicalism, 62 *n.*; Conciliar and Papalist, 339.
- Catholicity of the Church witnessed to by (1) the Greek of the N.T., (2) the Sermon or Homily, and (3) the Eucharistic Vestments, 385 and *n.*
- Catholics, 'uneducated and stupid', 124 *n.*; charged with Manichaeism, 87, 98, 124, 127 sq., 130 sq., 215; with Apollinarianism, 220.
- Catholicus*, The title, 269 and *n.*, 421; of Georgia, 415 sq.; of Armenia, 416.
- Celidonius, Bishop of Vesontio (Besançon), 356 sqq.
- Ceremonial, different from 'Ritual', 32; influence of the Court on, 40; of paganism on, 40, 243.
- 'Certus numerus', The, 101, 137 and *n.*, 146, 148.
- Chair of St. Peter, Feast of the, 309.
- Chalcedon, Council of (451), 311 sqq.; summoned (17 May), 313; president of, 314 and *n.*, 315; mainly Eastern, 314; first session (8 October), 315; second (10 October), 318; third (13 October), 320 sq.; fourth (17 October), accepts Tome of St. Leo, 321 sq.; fifth (22 October), issues *Definitio Fidei*, 324 sqq.; estimate of, 326; sixth (25 October), for its promulgation, 326 sqq.; legislation of, 328 sq.; seventh to fourteenth session, 329; creation of Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 330 sqq.; of Constantinople, 332 sqq.; Synodical letter to Leo, 335; its doctrinal decisions approved by him, 338; Imperial confirmation (452), 338 sq.; reaction in favour of Monophysitism after, 395 sqq.; its decisions not to be re-opened, 404 sq.; condemned (491), in Armenia, 424.
- Châlons, Battle of, 451; 342, 367.
- Charisius, a priest of Philadelphia, 247.
- Chasuble and alb, 152 and *n.*, 385.
- Christianity, influence on legislation, 11, 25; on morals, 42, 52 sq.; on war, 356, 367, 377; on the Goths, 43 sq.; pagan objections to, 46 sq.; frequency of conversions to, 131.
- Christians, bad lives of, 7; may serve as magistrates and inflict penalty of death, 8.
- Christology, of Diodore, 193 sqq.; of Apollinaris, 194; of Photinus, 195; of Nestorius, 201 sq., 207, 215, 230 sq.; of Paul of Samosata, 202 and *n.*, 408; of Proclus, 203 sq.; of Cyril, 209 and *n.*, 214, 216, 226 sqq., 236, 262, 266; of Leporius, 219; of Theodoret, 235, 287 sq., 291 sq.; of Paul, Bishop of Emesa, 260 sq.; of the *Tome* of St. Proclus, 273 sq.; of the ultra-Cyrrilline party, 283; of Eutyches, 285, 295 sqq., 395; of Flavian, 301 sq.; of the *Tome* of St. Leo, 303 sq., 318 sq., 394; of Council of Ephesus (449), 305 sq.; of Council of Chalcedon (451), 324 sqq., 395; of Antioch, 408; of Armenia, 425.
- Χριστολόκος, 206 *n.*, 208, 215, 230.
- Chrysaphius, 286, 299, 302, 311.
- Chrysostom, St. John, on Grace, 56; on the power of the will, 92; on eternal torment, 122; ordained Cassian, 142; loyalty of Constantinople to, 173; re-instated on diptychs of church of Antioch, 174; of Constantinople, 179; his relics brought home to Constantinople, 277.
- Church, The, a hospital, 69 *n.*
- Church-building, 372 *n.*, 384 sq., 414 *n.*, 429.
- Church-Steward, The office of, 247.
- Churches beyond the Empire, 414 sqq.
- Circumcellions, The, 14 sqq., 21, 25, 27.
- Civilian and Canonist standards of orthodoxy, 339.
- Clergy, continence of, 6 sq., 39 and *n.*; scarcity of, in Africa, 11; celibacy of, 39; not to preach about subtleties of doctrine 153, 356; secularity of, 329; rapacity of, 329, 362.
- Clerks in Holy Orders, to remain unmarried, 5; if married, not to cohabit, 7.
- Clovis, King of the Franks, 481-†511; 343, 369.
- Codex canonum ecclesiae Africanae*, 162 *n.*
- Co-inherence, The Divine, 239.
- Communio*, The, 32.
- Communion in one kind, 387 and *n.*

- Communion with the See of Rome not necessary, in order to be a Catholic, 359.
- 'Compel them to come in' (Luke xiv. 23), 18.
- Concessa, mother of St. Patrick, 349.
- Concupiscence, 61 sq.
- Confession of St. Patrick, 348; meaning of the word, 348 n.
- Confirmation, The minister of, 10; administered to infants, 69.
- Constantine, usurper, 407-†11; 103 n., 354, 367.
- Constantinople, walls of, 49 n.; Arianism at, 50; growth of the See of, 332 sqq., 407; Monophysite movements at, 411 sqq.
- Constantius III, Emp. 421; 103, 340 sq., 354 sq.
- Constantius of Lyons, 139, 347, 369.
- Constitution of the Church, Conciliar theory of the, 245.
- Coronation of Emperor by a bishop, First instance of, 398.
- Corotic, 348, 352.
- Cosmas Indicopleustes (c. 520), 429.
- Council, First abbot and layman to sit in a, 302.
- Counsels of Perfection, 76.
- Country house in Gaul, Life at a, 370 sq.
- Creationism, 84 sq., and 85 nn.
- Crispinus, Donatist Bishop of Calama, 13.
- Ctesiphon, an inquirer of Jerome, 87.
- Curialis, incapable of ordination, 6.
- Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon, 524-†49; 159.
- Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria (412-†44); 167, 170, 172, 179 sqq.; puts down Novatianists, 181; and Jews, 181; and Hypatia, 183 sq.; and Isidore, 187; on the source of Nestorianism, 196; did not ordinarily use *φύσις* of our Lord's Human Nature, 206 and n., 248, 273; right in his criticism of Nestorius, 208; intervenes against Nestorius (429), 209; *Paschal Letter* (429), 209; *Ad monachos Aegypti* (429), 210; *Advenerunt* (1 Ep. ad Nest. [429]), 211; *Obloquuntur* (2 Ep. ad Nest. [430]), 213 sqq., 242, 310, 318; *De recta fide*, 216 sq.; replies to Pope Caelestinus (Ap. 430), 220 sq.; *Adv. Nestorii blasphemias libri V* (Ap. 430), 221; letter to John of Antioch, 225; to Juvena
- of Jerusalem, 225; *Cum Salvator* (3 Ep. ad Nest.), 226 sqq., 242, 319; and its Twelve Anathematisms, 228, 242, 319; charged with Apollinarianism, 228, 231, 235; criticism of, 234 n.; *Apoloogia contra orientales* (431), 234 sq.; *Apol. c. Theodoretum pro XII capitibus* (431), 235; *hauteur* of, 235 sq.; *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias* (431), 236; starts for Council of Ephesus, 238 sq.; his (?) *Encomium in S. Mariam Deiparam*, 239; his indecent haste, 240; presides at Ephesus, 241; bribes the Court, 247, 252, 258 sq.; arrest of, 250; *Explicatio XII capitum* (431), 252; returns to Alexandria (30 October 431), 253; *Apol. ad Theodosium II*, 255 sq.; negotiations for Reunion, 257 sqq.; sticks to his XII Articles, 258; *Laetentur coeli* (23 April 432) to John of Antioch, 261, 318; disclaims Apollinarianism, 262; charged with defection, 265; *Μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, 265; accepts the *Tome of Proclus* (435), 274; death of, 280; character and services of, 280; contrast between his spontaneous and his official language, 283 and n., 325, 395; his XII Articles ratified by Council of Ephesus (449), 307; ignored by Council of Chalcedon (451), 319, 395; recognized by the *Henoticon* (482), 413.
- Cyril of Scythopolis, 523-†60; 400.
- Dadyeshu, Bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, 421-†56; and *Catholicus* of Persia, 271, 289.
- Dalmatius, abbot at Constantinople, †440; 190, 246, 251, 258, 285.
- Dancing, Licentious, 11.
- Daniel, an envoy of Cyril to Nestorius, 242, 246, 251.
- Daniel the Stylite, St., 411.
- De vocatione omnium gentium*, 434-61; 156 sq., 388.
- Death and sin, Connexion of, 112 and n.
- Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, c. 416; 8 sqq.
- Decretals, 3 sqq., 351, 356, 373, 392.
- Decurio, 349.
- Defensores ecclesiae*, 17, 393 sq.
- Demetrius, 45 sq., 76 sqq., 87.

Deogratias, Archbishop of Carthage, 454-†8; 7, 346, 377.
 Dereliction, 121 *n.*, 128 *n.*, 148.
 Development in doctrine, 155.
 Dioceses, size of, 308.
 Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus, 378-†94; 193 sqq., 268, 273.
 Dionysius Exiguus, †550; 163.
 Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 444-51; 280, 284 sq., 286, 302, 306 sq., 312, 315 sqq.; deposition of, 320 sq.; exile and death of, 402; relics restored to Alexandria, 408.
 Diptychs, The, 174 and *n.*, 178 sq., 406.
 Divination, 42.
 Divine decrees, The, 121, 145.
 Divorce followed by re-marriage is adultery, 8, 73.
 Docetism, 198, 283 *n.*, 408.
 Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch, 440-†52; 278, 289 sq., 304, 306 sq.
 Donatism, decline of, 401-11; 11 sqq.; the question of principle and of fact, 22 sq.
 Donatists, 375 sq.
 Donatus, Bishop of Nicopolis, 425-32; 265.
 Dorotheus, Bishop of Marcanopolis, 430-4; 211, 221, 254.
 'Double predestination', 121 *n.*
 Dulcitius, 24, 27.

East after Council of Chalcedon, The, 395 sqq.

Eastern Patriarchates, *c.* 410; 50 sqq.; rivalries of, 209, 238, 286, 302; of Jerusalem, 330 sqq., 400 sqq.; of Constantinople, 332 sqq., 411 sqq.; of Antioch, 331 sq., 408 sqq.; of Alexandria, 402 sqq.

Edessa (Urfa), prestige of, 255, 268; closing of the School of, 271 *n.*; memorial of the clergy of, 290 *n.*, 417.

Edict of Union, The, 15 sq.

Ἐκ δύο φύσεων and ἐν δύο φύσεσιν; 287 *n.*, 294 sq., 305, 324 sqq., 401, 403 and *n.*

Emeritus, Donatist Bishop of Caesarea in Mauretania, 21, 27.

Empire, Divisions of the, political, 4, 396; linguistic, 91 sq., 122 *n.*, 219, 304, 396, 408; ecclesiastical and civil, 176, 336, 354 sq.; spoken of (418) as 'Christian', 117, 362 sq., 385; oppressiveness of

the, 361, 365, 370; causes of the downfall of the, 363 sqq., 378; services of the, 363 *n.*; 'Christian and Catholic', 363; Churches beyond the, 414 sqq.,

Encyclical of Basiliscus, The, 476; 406, 410.

Energumens, 10.

Ephesus, Council of (431); summons to (November 430), 229; arrivals at, 238; a fortnight's delay there, 238 sq.; first session (22 June 431), 241 sq.; deposition of Nestorius, 243; proceedings of John, 243 sq.; Roman legates at (10 July), 244; second session (10 July), 244; third (11 July), 245; fourth (16 July), 245; fifth (17 July), 245; intervention of Dalmatius with the Emperor, 246; sixth session (22 July), 247; forbids any Creed other than the Nicene to be used as a baptismal Creed, 247; seventh session (31 July) about Cyprus, 248 sq.; John, High Commissioner, arrives (Aug. 431), 249; proceedings of Orientals at, 243 sq., 250 sq.; *Formula of Reunion*, 250; Theodosius II receives its envoys (11 September 431), 252; comes to an end, 253.

Episcopal benediction *super populum*, The, 99.

Equal standard for men and women, 8.

Eternal punishment, 121 sq.

Eucharist, carried in a basket and a glass, 6; as *Viaticum*, 8; argument from the Eucharist to the Incarnate Person, 69, 227 and *n.*, 287 *n.*, 389, 395 sq.; a sacrifice, 89; invocation of Holy Spirit at, 186; celebrated in private houses, 212 sq.; only offered at one church in Rome and Alexandria on Great Feasts, 285; Hour for the celebration of the, 372; fasting before, 372.

Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, 435-†50; 142, 362.

Eudocia (Athenais), Empress, 421-†53; 49, 217, 230, 276, 286, 302, 400 sqq.

Eudocia, daughter of Valentinian III, 346, 402.

Eudoxia, Empress of Valentinian III, 425-†55; and daughter of Eu-

- docia, 277, 309, 345 sq., 381, 383, 397, 402.
 Eugenius, Archbishop of Carthage, 481-†505; 378.
 Eulalius, Archdeacon of Rome, 165.
 Eulalius, Bishop of Chalcedon, 430-†51; 191.
 Eulalius, Bishop in Persarmenia, 271.
 Eulogius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, 404-†17; 92.
 Eulogius, envoy of Cyril at Constantinople, 265 sq.
 Euric, King of the Visigoths, 466-†85; 342, 369.
 Eusebius, Bishop of Ancyra, 292, 317, 334.
 Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, 448-51; 202, 294, 305, 308 sq., 315 sq.
 Eustathius, Bishop of Berytus, 448-58; 290, 312, 317, 323.
 Eustochium, †419; 184.
 Eutherius, Bishop of Tyana, 254, 258, 263.
 Euthymius, St., 377-†473; 400 sqq.
 Eutyches, 258, 285 sq., 290, 295 sqq., 305, 312, 395, 413; repudiated by Armenians, 425 and *n.*
 Eutychianism, 277 sqq., 283, 407.
 Euxitheus, Bishop of Thessalonica, 404.
 Evagrius, historian, 267 sq., 399 *n.*
 Evil not in matter but in a perverted will, 32.
 Ἐξαικλιονῆται, 49 *n.*
 Excommunication, 52 sq.
Executores (or *exactores*), 17.
 Exegesis, Different schools of, 187, 233 and *n.*
 Exorcism, 120, 128.
 Exposure of children, 122.
 Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, 405-†15; 6 sqq., 37, 40.
 Fabiola, 8.
 Faith, a reasonable principle, 31; and works, 73.
 Fall, denial of the, 55, 58, 61, 66; the Fathers explicit upon, 132.
 Fashions for ladies in fifth century, 78.
 Fastidius, a British bishop, 139.
 Fasting, before Ordination, 285; before Communion, 372.
 Faustinus, Bishop of Potentia, 418-†25; 163, 166, 169 sqq.
 Faustus, Abbot of Lerins and Bishop of Riez, 462-†85; 142, 154, 157 sq.; *De gratia*, 157.
 Faustus Byzantinus (fourth century), 419.
 Felix, a monk of Adrumetum, 135.
 Felix of Nola, St., 37.
 Felix IV, Pope, 528-†30; 159.
 Felix the Manichaeian, 29 sq.
Fermentum, The, 10.
Filioque, 374.
 Firmus, Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 431-†8; 231.
 First Four Councils, Authority of, 339.
 Flavian, Bishop of Philippi, 225, 238.
 Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, 446-†9; accession of, 281, 286, 294 sqq.; his Confession of Faith, 301, 304 sqq., 317; his *Appellatio*, 308 and *n.*
 Florentius the Patrician, 296 sqq.
 Florus, a monk of Adrumetum, 134.
 Fops of the fifth century, 78.
Formulary of Reunion, The, 250, 259 sqq., 265, 283.
 Free-will, Pelagian doctrine of, 59, 64; Augustine's doctrine of, 73, 77, 132, 135, 137.
 Frumentius, Bishop of Axum, 428.
 Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, 507-†33; 158.
 Gaiseric, King of the Vandals, 428-†77; 150, 343 *n.*, 345 sqq., 375 sqq.
 Galla Placidia, Empress, 425-†50; 103 sq., 111, 149, 165, 278, 309, 340 sqq., 380 sqq., 384.
 Gaudentius, Donatist Bishop of Tamugada, 21, 27.
 Gaul, Papal authority in, 5; German invasion of (406), 7, 42 *n.*; Pelagianism in, 137 sqq.; Semi-Pelagianism in, 141 sqq.; organization of the Church in, 353 sqq.; intelligence and piety in, 360 sqq.; social conditions of, 366 sqq.; universities of, 367.
 Gelasius, Pope, 492-†6; 287 *n.*, 389.
 Geneviève, St., 422-†512; 189.
 Gennadius, 362.
 Georgia, Church of, 414 sqq.
 Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, 418-†48; 138 sqq., 343, 347, 350.
 Gerontius, †484; 400, 402 *n.*, 416.
 Gladiatorial games, Abolition of, 42.
 Glycerius, Emp. 472-†3; 382.
 Good Friday, The intercessions on, 140.
 Gospel, lights at the, 40; sitting at the, 429.

- Gospels symbolical of our Lord's Presence, The Book of the, 241, 296 and *n.*
- Grace, doctrine of, 54 sqq.; Chrysostom on, 56; prevenient, 56, 82, 141, 157; Pelagian doctrine of, 62, 79 sqq., 87, 96, 100, 135, 145; meaning of, 62 *n.*, 99 *n.*; means of, 62 *n.*; not destructive of nature, 68, 81; co-operative, 82; Catholic doctrine of, 112, 117, 131, 135, 151; Augustine and Pelagius on, 116; irresistible or 'indefectible', 122 and *n.*, 129, 135, 137; Julian's doctrine of, 124; 'Grace is predestination taking effect', 147; Leo I on, 156, 158.
- Gregory the Illuminator, St., 420.
- Helladius, Bishop of Tarsus, c. 430; 254, 258, 263, 275.
- Ἑνωσις φυσική*, 228 *n.*, 235 *n.*
- Henoticon*, The, 272, 397, 399, 413, 425.
- Heraclian, Count of Africa, 408-†13; 17, 43, 76.
- Heraclius, Bishop of Hippo, 138.
- Heresy, Repression of, 14 sq., 24, 192 sq., 202, 373, 411; often due to misguided reverence, 283 and *n.*; extent of, 308; flourishes where repressive legislation has been broken down by barbarian invasions, 373.
- Hermanric, King of the Suevæ, 409-41; 372.
- Heros, Bishop of Arles, 409-12; 92, 98, 103 *n.*, 104, 106, 108, 354.
- Hierarchy, precedence in the, 175 sq.
- Hierax, a schoolmaster of Alexandria, 182.
- Hilarion, 300-†71; 426.
- Hilary, a layman of Syracuse, 65, 75, 90, 94, 144, 151, 356.
- Hilary, a retired officer who objected to ritual, 32.
- Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, 429-†49; 142, 144, 146, 154, 343, 355 sqq.
- Hilary, Pope, 461-†8; 303, 307 and *n.*, 308, 390.
- Himerius, Bishop of Nicomedia, 254.
- Himyar (Homer), kingdom of, 427, 429.
- Hippo, blockade of, 430-1; 150.
- 'Home Synod', The, 294 and *n.*, 404.
- Honoratus, Archbishop of Arles, 429-†49; 141 sq., 355.
- Honoratus, Bishop of Cirta, 376.
- Honoratus, Bishop of Marseilles, 475-†92; 355 *n.*
- Honoratus, Bishop of Thiava, c. 428; 150 sq., 375.
- Honoria, daughter of Galla Placidia, 340, 380.
- Honorius, Emp. 395-†423; represses schism, 15 sq., 17, 24; triumph of (402), 41 sq., 103; his rescript (418), in condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius, 111, 163; letter to Aurelius (419), 124; death of, 149, 340; intervenes at papal elections, 165, 168.
- Hormisdas, Pope, 514-†23; 158.
- Houssik, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 341-†7; 421.
- Houssik, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 373-†7; 422.
- Human nature, doctrine of, 80, 87, 132.
- Doctrine of our Lord's, 194, 198, 235, 248, 260 sq., 273, 283, 297 sq., 301, 324 sq., 395, 408.
- Huneric, King of the Vandals, 477-†84; 346, 375, 378.
- Huns, invasion of the, 313 sq., 342, 363; downfall of the, 344.
- Hypatia, 50, 183 sq.
- Hypatius, abbot at Chalcedon, 406-†46; 191.
- Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos*, 434-61; 156, 388.
- Ὑπόστασις*, 274.
- Hypostatic Union, The, 214, 228 *n.*
- Iazdgerd I, King of Persia, 399-†420; 172, 268.
- Iazdgerd II, King of Persia, 438-†57; 424.
- Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, 435-†57; 270 sq., 281, 289 sqq. 302, 307, 329.
- Iberia, *see* Georgia.
- Idacius, Bishop of Aquae Flaviae, Chronicle of, 343 *n.*
- Illus, Master of the Offices, 412.
- Illyria, Papal authority in, 3 sqq., 131; handed over (421) to Constantinople, 281 *n.*
- Illyricum, Papal Vicariate of Eastern, 4, 131, 282 *n.*
- Illyricum, Western, 4, 277 sq., 282 and *n.*
- Impeccability of our Lord, 199 *n.*
- Imperial Court on ceremonial of the Church, Influence of the, 40.

- Impersonality of our Lord's human nature, 147, 200 sq., 207 n.
- Incarnation, and the Fall, 68.
- 'India' (between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf), 427.
- Infant Baptism, 62, 66 sqq., 67 n., 68 sq.; *rationale* of, 70, 74; argument from, 75, 105 n., 116, 128; Caelestius on, 105; taken for granted by both sides, in fifth century, 112; Julian's doctrine of, 124 sq.
- Infant Communion, 69, 102, 265.
- Infants dying unbaptized are lost, 74, 112, 120.
- Innocent I, Pope, 402-†17; 3 sqq., 42, 46, 78 n., 91, 99; three letters of (417), 101 sq.; death of, 102, 123, 143, 165, 174 sqq., 248, 354, 384.
- Institutions of the Church, a check to heresy, 66, 68 sq., 75, 99, 102, 105 n., 116, 119 sq., 128, 140 sq., 149.
- Insufflation, 120, 128.
- Invocation of the Holy Spirit, The, 186.
- Ireland, Palladius sent to, 431; 139, 347.
- Irenaeus, Count, 237, 246; Bishop of Tyre (447-8), 267; his *Tragoedia*, 267, 281 sq.; his deposition (448), 288; ditto (449), 307.
- Isaac, a hermit at Constantinople, 190.
- Isidore of Pelusium, †440; 179 sq., 186 sqq., 251 sq., 264.
- Ius Cyprium*, The, 175 sqq., 248 sq.
- Ius liturgicum* of bishops, 17.
- 'Jacobites', 399.
- James Baradaeus, Bishop of Edessa, 543-†78; 399.
- Jerome, †420; on the invasion of Gaul (406), 7; in controversy with Augustine, 32 sqq.; Comm. on *Job* (393), 33; on *Galatians* (386-7), 33; in controversy with Vigilantius (404-6), 36 sqq.; on places of pilgrimage, 37; *Contra Vigilantium* (406), 38; on *Ezekiel* (410), 44; on the capture of Rome, 44; receives Roman exiles, 45; and Rufinus, 57; letter to Demetrias, 77 sq.; on fashions and fops, 78; on Orosius, 84; on Creationism and Traducianism, 84 sq., 85 nn.; in controversy with Pelagianism (415), 87 sqq.; *Dialogus adv. Pelagianos* (415), 87 sq.; on Apollinarianism, 89; on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 89; inclined to Semi-Pelagianism, 89; on Synod of Diospolis (415), 96; attacked by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 98; his monastery raided, 98; *Chronicon* of, 145; death of (420), 184 sq.
- Jews in the Roman Empire, Position of, 181 sq.
- John, Archdeacon of Nestorius, 245.
- John, Bishop of Germanicia, 263.
- John, Bishop of Jerusalem, 386-†417; 86, 89 sqq., 92, 100, 103.
- John, chaplain and envoy of Cyril, 247.
- John, Count, 249.
- John, Emp. 423-†4; 149, 341.
- John, Patriarch of Antioch (428-†41), 185, 192, 222 sq.; sides with Caelestine and Cyril against Nestorius, 225, 231, 239; arrives at Ephesus, 243; deposes Cyril and Memnon, 244; adopts *Formula of Reunion*, 250; inclined to peace, 255; Imperial letter (432) to, 256; efforts at Reunion, 256 sqq.; abandons Nestorius, 261; accepts the *Tome of Proclus*, 274; death of, 278.
- John Talaia, Patriarch of Alexandria, 482; 412.
- Julian, Bishop of Cos, 448-58; 304, 309, 313, 404, 406.
- Julian, Bishop of Eclanum (417-†54), 58 sq., 114; knew both Latin and Greek, 122 n., 123 sqq.; and Zosimus, 124 sqq.; his *Libellus Fidei*, 124; condemned by Pope and Emperor, 125; by others, 126; finds refuge with Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, 126, 196; his controversial methods, 128; examination of his arguments, 132; death of, 133; attempts to recover his see (439), 156; in Constantinople, 212.
- Juliana, mother of Demetrias, 45, 76, 94.
- Juliana, mother of Julian, Bishop of Eclanum, 123.
- Julius, Bishop of Puteoli, 303.
- Just, Vigil and Feast of St., 372.
- Justification, doctrine of, 72 n., 160 n.
- Justin I, Emp. 518-†27; 399.

- Justinian, Emp. 527-†65; 399, 414 and *n.*
- Juvenal, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 428-†58; 223, 238, 304, 306, 312, 315, 317, 331 sq., 400 sqq.
- ‘Kingdom of heaven’ and ‘eternal life’, 62, 105.
- Kiss of Peace, The, 9.
- Kyrion I, *Catholicus* of Georgia, c. 609; 416.
- Kyrion II, *Catholicus* of Georgia, 1917; 416.
- Lampetius, a Messalian, 186.
- Lateran, The, 386.
- Latrocinium*, The, 449; 301 sqq.
- Law, office of the, 132.
- Laymen allowed to speak at synods, 296 sq.
- Lazarus, Bishop of Aix, 409-12; 92, 104, 106, 108, 354.
- Leo I, Emp. 457-†74; 397 sq., 403.
- Leo II, Emp. †474; 398.
- Leo I, Pope, 440-†61; as acolyte, 114; as archdeacon, 152, 155, 219, 222; rules out Augustinianism, 155 sq.; canons of (435), 156; becomes Pope, 278; as preacher, 279, 389, 391; his theory of the authority of his see, 279 sq., 299; his doctrine of the priesthood of the laity, 280; his letter to Dioscorus (445), 284 sq.; Eutyches appeals to, 298; letters to Flavian and Theodosius II, 299; *Tome* of (448), 299 sq., 303 sq., 310, 316, 318 sq.; accepts General Council at Ephesus (449), 303; heads the reaction against it, 307 sqq.; thinks another General Council unnecessary, 312 sq., 314; accepts it, 313; his *Tome* examined and accepted at Chalcedon, 321 sq.; opposes the elevation of Constantinople into a Patriarchate, 333 sqq.; reasons for his opposition, 336 sqq.; approves the doctrinal decisions of the Council, 338; goes out to meet Attila (451), 345, 381; and Gaiseric (455), 345; receives St. Patrick 351; his treatment of Hilary of Arles, 357 sq.; procures Rescript of Valentinian III (445), 358; his *Tome* accepted by Milan, Gaul, and Spain, 359; letter to Turibius, Bishop of Astorga (447), 373; administers the church in Mauretania, 377; episcopate of, 382 sqq.; found Rome Christian and left it Catholic, 383 sqq.; puts down Novatianists, 386; Manichaeans, 386 sqq.; Pelagians, 388; Arians, 389; Eutychians, 389 sq.; argues from the Eucharist to the Incarnate Person, against the Eutychians, 389; the authority of the Roman See in his day, 390 sqq.; his death and character, 394; his care for the unity of the Church, 396; intervenes in Palestine (453), 401 sq.; in Egypt (457), 403 sqq.
- Leontius, Bishop of Forum Julii [Fréjus], 419-†32; 142.
- Leontius of Byzantium, 458-†543; 68.
- Leovigild, King of the Visigoths, 572-†86; 374.
- Leporius, a monk of Trèves, 137 sq., 219.
- Lerins, Isles of the, 141 sq., 350, 355 sq., 360, 372.
- Letter and Spirit, 71 sq., 152.
- Lex orandi lex credendi*, 149.
- Liberatus, c. 560; *Breviarium causae Nestorianae et Eutychianae*, 284, 399 *n.*
- Lights and incense, 243.
- ‘Limbus infantum’, 112.
- Linguistic division of East and West, 91.
- Little Entrance, The, 296 *n.*
- Liturgical, experts in demand, 17; dress, 89, 152.
- Lupercalia, The, 383.
- Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, 433-†79; 138 sqq., 142, 347, 369, 372.
- Macedonians, The, 193.
- Macedonius, an ascetic, 233 sq.
- Majorian, Emp. 457-†61; 368, 377, 382.
- Mamertus, Archbishop of Vienne, 463-†75; 369, 372.
- Manichaeans, 15, 29 sqq., 83, 185, 215, 374, 386 sq.
- Manichaeism, attractions of, 30 sq., 60; charged against Catholics, 87, 98, 124, 127 sq., 130 sq., 215.
- Mansuetus, Bishop of Toul, c. 350; 347.
- Manuel, Regent of Armenia, 378-†85; 423.
- Marcella, †410; 43 sq.
- Marcellinus, 19 sqq., 69, 84 sq.

- Marcellus, Abbot, 440-†86; 188.
 Marcian, Emp. 450-†7; 311, 397, 400, 424.
 Marina, sister of Theodosius II, 49, 216.
 Marinus, Count of Africa, 413-14; 24.
 Maris, Bishop of Ardashir, 271, 289.
 Marius Mercator, *fl.* 418-60; 56, 58, 98, 125; *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii*, 212, 215; *Nestorii blasphemiarum capitula*, 231; perhaps the author of the *Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos*, 388 *n.*
 Marriage, of clergy, 57; with deceased wife's sister, 5; institution of, 61; why ordained, 118, 127 *n.*; Augustine on, 126 sq., 132.
 Marseilles, a *focus* of Christian influence in Gaul, 142 sqq., 360.
 Martyrius, Patriarch of Antioch, 460-70; 409.
 Mâruthâ, Bishop of Maiferkat, 268.
 Mary, perpetual virginity of, 4 and *n.*; immaculate conception of, 82.
 Mass, not to be said on Friday or Saturday, 10; the chants of the, 32, 317 and *n.*, 377.
 'Massa perditionis', 54, 121 and *n.*, 136 *n.*, 148.
 Maundy Thursday, 10.
 Mavia, Queen of the Saracens, 426.
 Maximian, a bishop of Constantinople, 431-†4; 252, 253, 258, 260 sq., 264.
 Maximian, Bishop of Bagai, 14, 19.
 Maximianists, 12 and *n.*, 20, 23.
 Maximin, Bishop of Anazarbus, 258.
 Maximus, a monk of Antioch, 408.
 Maximus, Patriarch of Antioch, 449-†55; 309, 312, 315.
 Mazdaism enforced by edict, 449; 424.
 Melania I, 350-†410; 45, 115.
 Melania II, 383-†439; 46, 184, 185 *n.*, 383, 400, 416.
 'Melkites', 399, 406.
 Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, 431-†40; 238, 250.
 Memor, a bishop, 123.
 Merit, doctrine of, 101; grace not given according to, 131, 135, 148.
 Mesrob, †441; 423.
 Messalians, The, 185 sq., 188, 410.
 Metropolitans, System of, in Gaul, 104, 353; in 'the East', 178; in Spain, 373 sq.
Mia φύσις τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, 236 and *n.*, 265 sq., 274; 283.
 'Middle place, The', 112 and *n.*
 Ministry, The, a gift from above, 153.
 Minutes, Advantage of taking, 91 *n.*
 Miracles, 38 sq.
 Mirian, King of Georgia, 415.
 Missions, in Flanders, 5; in Ireland, 350 sqq.; in Armenia, 420; in Abyssinia, 428; in Ceylon and on the Malabar Coast, 429.
 Mixed marriage blessed by the Church, The one instance of a, 51.
 Monasticism, 39, 45, 141 sqq., 153, 184 sqq., 233 sq., 352, 372 and *n.*
 Monks, disorderliness of, 183, 328, 407; in Palestine, 400 sqq.; in Constantinople, 407, 411; in 'Arabia', 426 sq.
 Monophysitism, 266; meaning of, 395 *n.*; reaction, after Chalcedon, in favour of, 395 sqq.; its strength due to its devotion to our Lord's Deity, 409; in Armenia, 425.
 Moses, Bishop of Paran, 427.
 Nana, Queen of Georgia, 415.
 Narsai, martyr in Persia, 420; 172 *n.*
 Nationalism, a source of heresy, 403.
 Nedao, Battle of the, 454; 344.
 Nepos, Emp. 473-†5; 382.
 Nerses, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 353-†73; 421 sqq.
 Nestorianism and Pelagianism, 57 and *n.*, 126, 138, 144, 199, 219; Cassian writes against, 152, 219; within the Empire (428-35), 192 sqq.; source of, 196; takes root in Persia, 271 sqq.; in Armenia, 424.
 Nestorius, Archbishop of Constantinople (428-31); his appointment, 173; warned against Messalians, 185 sq.; early history of, 193; sermons in support of Anastasius, 202; not a follower of Paul of Samosata, 202; sermons in reply to Proclus, 204 sq.; his teaching in the *Book of Heraclides*, 205 sqq., 267; his criticism of Cyril, 206; his doctrine of Christ's Person, 207 sqq., 215; was a Nestorian, 208 *n.*; not a Pelagian, 212; letters to Pope Caelestine, 213, 219 sq.; reply to Cyril's second letter (430), 215; reply to John of Antioch (430), 226; drafts the citation to Ephesus, 229 sq.; sermon of 13 December 430, 230 sq.; his Twelve Counter-Anathematisms, 231; starts for

- Council of Ephesus, 237; deposition of, 243; arrest of, 250; sent back to Antioch, 252, 267; exile and death of (June 451), 267.
- 'Nicene' canons, 165.
- Nicene Creed fatal, by anticipation, to Nestorianism, 214, 231.
- Nicephorus Callistus (*fl.* 1320-30); 302 *n.*
- Nilus, †430; 186 sq.
- Nina, a Christian captive in Georgia, 415.
- Nisibis, becomes Persian, 268; school of, 271 *n.*; well-spring of Nestorianism throughout the East, 271 *n.*; political history of, 417 *n.*
- Nitria, The monks of, 183 sq.
- Nonnus, Bishop of Edessa, 457-†71; 271.
- Notitia Dignitatum*, c. 402, The; 40 *n.*
- Novatianists, at Constantinople, 173, 193; at Alexandria, 181; in Lydia, 247; at Rome, 386.
- 'Nullus in vitis detur episcopus', 153 and *n.*, 348.
- Numidia, Prevalence of Donatism in, 16.
- Odovacar, King of Italy, 476-†93; 382, 388 *n.*, 394.
- Olybrius, Consul, 395; 76.
- Olybrius, Emp. †472; 382, 397 *n.*
- Olympius, Master of the Offices, 16.
- 'One Incarnate Nature', 236, 265, 273 sq., 283, 297, 301, 395.
- 'One Person, in two Natures', 395.
- Ordinances, Jewish and Christian, 68 *n.*, 122 *n.*
- Ordination, municipal office a bar to, 6; digamy a bar to, 282, 288; shedding of blood a bar to, 357.
- Orestes, Prefect of Egypt, 182 sqq.
- Origen, †254; errors of, 84.
- Original Sin, 55, 60 and *n.*, 67, 73, 148; denied by Caelestius (417), 105, 116; and by Pelagius, 117; and by Julian, 124; defended by Augustine, 127; Pelagian arguments against, 127 sq.; Catholic doctrine of, 151; held by Nestorius, 224.
- Orosius (*fl.* 414-18), 43; *Histories* of (417-18), 48, 362; at Hippo (414), 83; *Consultatio* of, 83 sq.; arrives in Palestine (415), 87; at the Synod of Jerusalem (415), 89 sqq.; *Liber apologeticus de arbitrii libertate* (415), 91; returns to Africa (416), 98, 343.
- Ostrogoths, The, 42, 344.
- Pagan objections to Christianity, 46 sq., 360 sqq.
- Paganism, repression of, 11; at Alexandria, 183; in Rome, 363, 383; in Armenia, 420, 422.
- Palestine, Monophysitism in, 400 sqq.; 'the three Palestines', 400 and *n.*
- Palladia, wife of Salvian, 361.
- Palladius, Bishop in Ireland, 431; 347 sq.
- Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis, c. 400; 173.
- Pammachius, †409; 57, 66, 185.
- Pap, King of Armenia, 367-†74; 418, 422.
- Papal autocracy the creation of the civil power, 358, 386.
- Papal legates, did not rank above the local hierarchy, 166 *n.*
- Papal Vicar, of Gaul, 104, 354, 393; of Eastern Illyricum, 104, 223, 389, 392.
- Papalism, repudiated by the Church of Africa, 169 sqq.; incompatible with the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus, 246 *n.*; in Italy, 394.
- Papianilla, 367.
- Parables of the Wheat and the Tares, &c., 22 *n.*
- Parabolani*, 183 sq.
- Paren, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 348-†52; 421.
- Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybaeum and papal legate at Chalcedon, 313 sqq., 333 sqq.
- Pass of the Pear Tree, The, 41, 381.
- Passarion, archimandrite, 400.
- Pastor, *Libellus in modum Symboli*, 374.
- Patiens, Archbishop of Lyons, 451-†91; 369 sq., 372.
- Patrick, St., Apostle of Ireland, Bishop 432-†61; 348; authorities for, 348; early life, 349 sq.; at Lerins, 350; consecrated bishop, 350; visits St. Leo at Rome, 351; settles at Armagh (444), 351; character of his work, 351 sq.; his death, 352.
- Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, 412-†26; 103 sq., 153, 354, 357.
- Paul, Bishop of Emesa, 256 sqq.
- Paula, the elder, †404; 184, 185 *n.*
- Paula, the younger, 184, 185 *n.*

- Paulinus, a deacon of Milan, 64 sq., 105, 109.
- Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, 409-†31; 5 sq., 36 sq., 56, 100, 109, 123, 141.
- Pelagianism and Nestorianism, 57 and *n.*, 126, 138, 144, 198 sq., 219; a reaction from Augustinianism, 57 and *n.*; sketch of, 58 sqq.; in Africa, 65 sqq.; Augustine's arguments against, 68, 132; its doctrine of human nature, 80, 87; and Stoicism, 59, 86 sq.; stock-texts of, 88; its charges against Catholics, 131; a novelty, 132; its overthrow (420-31), 132 sq.; the gain to Christianity thereby, 133; in Gaul and Britain, 137 sqq., 347; how it resembles and differs from Semi-Pelagianism, 144; in Constantinople, 224; in Rome, 388 sq.; a 'proud error', 389 and *n.*
- Pelagius, 45, 55 sqq.; his *Testimoniorum Liber*, 56; character of, 56, 71, 81; intimacy with Paulinus of Nola, 56, 100; in Rome c. 400, *Commentary on Ep. to Romans*, 58 and *n.*; *Ep. ad Demetriadem*, 58 *n.*, 78 sqq.; in Sicily, 65; in Africa, 65; meets Augustine, 65; in Palestine, 65; *Comm. on St. Paul's Epistles*, 66, 70, 114; on riches and oaths, 75; *De natura*, 80, 100; Augustine's testimony to, 81; and Jerome (415), 87; at the synod of Jerusalem (415), 90 sq.; his personal appearance, 55, 91; at the synod of Diospolis (415), 92 sqq.; spoke both Greek and Latin, 92; acquittal of, 95; 'stole absolution', 96, 117; *Pro libero arbitrio*, 97, 107, 116; inadequate senses of grace, 97, 116; excommunicated by Pope Innocent (417), 101; his *Libellus Fidei* (418), 107; exonerated by Pope Zosimus, 108 sq.; banished by Honorius (418), 111; disclaims the opinions charged against him, 115; denies original sin, 117; condemned at Ephesus (431), 133.
- Penance, mitigation of ancient severity of, 7 sq.; of Fabiola, 8; not to be refused *in extremis*, 155.
- Permanence of our Lord's Human Nature, 395 sq.
- Persecution leads to a revival of religion, 376.
- Persia, The Church in, persecution of, 172 and *n.*, 426; history of, 268 sqq.; independence of, 270, 413, 426; Nestorianism in, 270 sqq., 425 sq.; Creed of, 272; Liturgy of, 272; colonists of the, 429.
- Persian and the Roman Empires, Rivalry of the, 192, 270, 413, 415, 418.
- Persian Gulf, Christians on the, 429.
- Peshitta, The, 188.
- Peter, Bishop of the Saracens, 427.
- Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna, 433-†49; 299.
- Peter Mongus (the Stammerer), Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, 477-†90; 411 sqq.
- Peter the Fuller, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, 470-†88; 409 sqq.
- Peter the Iberian, Bishop of Maiuma, 416.
- Peter's Chains, St., 385.
- Petilian, Donatist Bishop of Cirta, 21.
- Petrine hierarchy, Theory of a, 174 sqq.
- Petronius Maximus, Emp. 455; 345.
- Philaster, Bishop of Brescia, 379-†87; 149.
- Philip, a Roman presbyter and legate, in Africa, 163; at Ephesus, 237, 244.
- Philip of Side, c. 430; 173.
- Photius, Bishop of Tyre, 448-51; 289 sq., 323.
- Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 858-69 and 878-86; 187.
- Φύσις, 206; once used by Cyril of our Lord's human nature, 248, 266, 297.
- Pilgrimage, places of, 37, 277 sq., 386, 400.
- Pinian, †431-2; 46, 115, 185 *n.*
- Piroz, King of Persia, 457-†84; 272.
- Placidia, daughter of Valentinian III, 346, 397 and *n.*, 402.
- Plays and actors, 11, 45.
- Pollentia, Battle of, 402; 41.
- Porphyrius, Bishop of Antioch, 404-†13; 188, 269.
- Porphyry, objections of, 35.
- Posidonius, envoy of Cyril, 221, 224; and of Dioscorus, 284.
- Possessor, an African bishop, 158.
- Possidius, Bishop of Calama, 13, 17, 21, 150, 375 sq.

- Potitus, grandfather of St. Patrick, 349.
- Praetitorum sedis Apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei*, c. 435; 156.
- Pragmatic Sanction, Meaning of, 323 and *n.*
- Prayers for the Faithful Departed, 40 *n.*
- Praylius, Bishop of Jerusalem, 416-†25; 106, 108, 331.
- Preaching, Undue exaltation of, 233 *n.*; at Arles, 355; of St. Leo, 279, 389, 391.
- Predestinarianism, 101, 120 sqq., 131, 137; modified, in Augustine, by his sacramentalism, 122; objections to, 145; refuted, 156; of Lucidus, 157.
- Predestination and reprobation, 121 and *n.*, 128 *n.*, 146, 149; Prosper's view of, 154.
- Predestinatus* (c. 440), The; 156.
- Priesthood of the ministry not incompatible with the priesthood of the laity, The, 280.
- Primates of Numidia and Mauretania, 13 *n.*
- Primian, Donatist Bishop of Carthage, 20 sqq.
- Primianists, 12 and *n.*
- Principia, 43.
- Priscillian, Bishop of Avila, 380-†5; errors of, 83; followers of, 185, 373 sq.; tenets of, 373 sq.
- Proba, 45, 76 sq.
- Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicus, then of Constantinople (434-†46), 173, 203, 264; *Tome* of (435), 273, 277, 281, 289, 383, 424.
- Procopius, *fl.* 500-60; *De bello Vandalico*, 343 *n.*
- Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, 138.
- Profuturus, Bishop of Cirta, 33 sqq.
- Projectus, papal legate at Ephesus, 237, 244.
- 'Proles, fides, sacramentum', 118 *n.*, 127 *n.*
- Prologus Galeatus*, 391; 32.
- Πρόσωπον, 207 and *n.*
- Prosper of Aquitaine (†463), 139, 144 sq., 151 sqq.; and Caelestine, 153 sq.; and Sixtus III, 154; *Contra Collatorem* (443-4), 154, 356; *Carmen de Providentia Divina* (c. 416), 360 sq.; *Poema conjugis ad uxorem*, 361.
- Proterius, Patriarch of Alexandria, †457; 402 sq.
- Publicola, †405; 45, 185 *n.*
- Pulcheria, Empress 450-†3; 49, 172, 217, 230, 277, 286, 302, 304, 310 sqq., 381, 397, 400 sq.
- Punic, spoken in Africa, 168.
- Purgatory, 89.
- Quartodecimans, The, 193, 247.
- Quicumque vult*, The, 142, 247 sq.
- 'Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus', 155, 226 *n.*
- Quodvultdeus, Archbishop of Carthage, 437-†54; 149, 376.
- Rabbûla, Bishop of Edessa, 412-†35; 188, 255, 264, 271, 273, 281, 289, 424.
- Racialism, a menace to Christian unity, 397, 403.
- Radagaisus, 41 sq.
- Ravenna, 41 sqq., 149, 164, 299.
- Ravennius, Archbishop of Arles, 449-†55; 359.
- Reader, the minor Order of, 123, 377, 407 *n.*
- Real Presence, Doctrine of the, 227 *n.*, 287 *n.*
- Reccared, King of the Visigoths, 588-†601; 374.
- Rechiar, King of the Sueves, 448-†57; 373.
- Rechila, King of the Sueves, 441-†8; 373.
- 'Recitation of names', The, 9.
- Reconciliation of penitents, 10.
- Relics, objection to, 37; honour to, 37, 277 sq.
- Remigius, Archbishop of Rheims, 457-†533; 369, 372.
- Renatus, papal legate at Council of Ephesus, 449; 303, 308.
- Reprobation, 121 *n.*
- Responsales*, 210.
- Resurrection, Weekly and annual commemoration of the, 10.
- Ricimer, †472; 368, 381 sq.
- Rite, the Roman, 8; the non-Roman rite of the West, 9.
- Rites and ceremonies: to be uniform, 8; may vary, 10 *n.*; differ from each other, 32 *n.*
- 'Ritual' different from 'Ceremonial', 32.
- 'Ritual-murder', Stories of, 182.
- Rogations, 369.
- 'Roma locuta est; causa finita est', 102, 117 *n.*
- Roman church, to be the model of other churches, 6, 11; influence

- of, 100 ; clergy of, 131 ; primary of, 333 sqq.
- Roman See, Authority of the, 3 sqq., 6 sq., 46, 101 sq. ; African view of it, 110 ; gains by the breakdown of synodical action in Africa, 152 ; case of Apiarius, 162 sqq. ; over Alexandria, 221 n., 285 ; mystical presence of St. Peter in his successors, 245 and n., 279, 299 ; Theodoret's view of, 292 and n., 308 and n. ; appeal of Celidonium to, 357 ; Rescript of Valentinian III (445) in favour of, 358 ; profited by the barbarian invasions, 374, 381 ; largely due to powers conferred by the State, 386 ; its authority under Pope Leo I, 390 sqq.
- Rome, Churches of, 383 sqq. ; St. John Lateran, 8, 383 ; St. Peter, 43 sq., 384 ; St. Paul, 43, 384 ; capture of, by Alaric, 40 sqq. ; by Gaiseric, 45, 145, 278, 345 ; Salarian Gate of, 43 ; great families of, 46 ; under Pope Leo I, 383 sqq.
- Romulus Augustulus, Emp. 475-6 ; 366, 378.
- Rufinus, a Syrian, 57.
- Rufinus of Aquileia, †410 ; 45, 57, 86, 185, 415.
- Rufinus of Rome, 57, 66.
- Rufinus, the minister of Arcadius, 41.
- Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, 410-†31 ; 4, 126, 130 sq., 223, 225, 238, 249.
- Rutilius Namatianus, 363.
- Sacramentalism, 122 n. ; arguments against, 283.
- Sacraments, doctrine of the, 62 n. ; how they differ from Jewish ordinances, 122 n.
- Sacred vessels, sold for the relief of the poor, 7, 346 and n., 356, 377 ; of St. Peter's, Rome, 44 ; of the Temple at Jerusalem, 346 and n.
- Sahak (Isaac), *Catholicus* of Armenia, 387-†439 ; 423.
- Salvian, 400-†80 ; 39, 142, 343, 361 sqq. ; *Adversus avaritiam*, 362 ; *De gubernatione Dei* (439-51), 362 sqq.
- Sanctorum communionem*, 40.
- Sardica, Canons of, 164.
- Sassanidae, The, 417.
- Saturday, a fast-day at Rome, 10 ; a feast-day in Milan and East, 10 n.
- 'Scholasticus', meaning of, 393, 399 n.
- 'Scot' means an 'Irishman', 55.
- Scripture, authority of, 33, 36.
- Scythian monks, The, 158.
- 'Second' nature', 62, 79.
- Seleucia-Ctesiphon, capital of Persia, 268 sq.
- Seleucus, Bishop of Amasea, 295, 305.
- Semi-Pelagianism, of Jerome, 89 ; a reaction from Augustinianism, 120 ; its rise and history, 133 sqq. ; in Africa, 140 sq. ; Hooker on, 140 ; date of the name, 140 and n. ; of Cassian, 143 ; how it resembles and differs from Pelagianism, 144 ; and from Augustine, 144 and n. ; in South of Gaul, 146, 152, 356.
- Septimus, Bishop of Altinum, c. 444 ; 388.
- Septuagint, authority of the, 32.
- Sermon on the Mount, The, 25, 383.
- Sermons, congregation in Africa stands at, 231 ; in Gaul sits at, 355 ; length of, 355.
- Severian, a Pelagian bishop, in Britain, 139.
- Severus, Bishop of Treves, 446-†55 ; 140.
- Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Urbs Arverna (Clermont-Ferrand), 472-†89 ; 139, 343, 364, 366 sqq.
- Simeon Stylites, St., 388-†459 ; 189 sqq., 233, 253, 402, 404 sq.
- Simplicius, Pope, 468-†83 ; 406, 411 sq.
- Sin, and Grace, 54 sqq., 60, 80 sq. ; transmission of, 66, 105 ; a disease, 69 n. ; sins not equal, 86 ; not necessary to complete manhood, 89 ; no sin which is not personal, 105 ; Catholic doctrine of, 112.
- Sisinnius, a deacon, 34.
- Sisinnius, Archbishop of Constantinople, 426-†7 ; 173, 192, 224.
- Sixtus III, Pope, 432-†40 ; 100, 114, 118 sqq., 134 ; and Prosper, 154, 261, 263 ; death of, 278, 282, 384.
- Socotra, Christians in, 429.
- Socrates, on Origen, 50 ; finishes his *History*, 267, 278.
- Solifidianism, 73.
- Soul, no part of the divine substance, 84 ; origin of the, 84 sq.
- Spain, invaded by the Vandals (409),

- 83; conquered by the Visigoths (456), 342, 373; by Mohamedans (711), 343; by the Sueves (409), 372 sq.; Priscillianism in, 373 sq.
- State a Divine Institution, The, 8.
- Stephen, Bishop of Hierapolis, 446-59; 289.
- Stephen, Exarch of Ephesus, 315, 330.
- Stephen, Patriarch of Antioch, 478-†82; 410.
- Stilicho, †408; wishes to recover Eastern Illyricum for the Western Empire, 4, 12, 16, 41 sq.
- Succensus, Bishop of Diocaesarea, 266.
- Sueves, The, 150, 341 sq., 373.
- Sulpicius Severus, 363-†425; 36, 141.
- Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemaïs, 410-†13; 50 sqq.
- Synod, of Rome (402), 5; Fifth African (401), 11; Sixth African (401), 11 sq.; Seventh African (402), 13; Eighth African (403), 13; Ninth African (404), 14; Tenth African (405), 16; Eleventh to Thirteenth African (407-8), 16 sq.; Fifteenth African (410), 17, 19; Cabarsussi (393), 23; of Carthage (411-12), 66, 68, 94; of Carthage (418), 83; of Jerusalem (415), 89 sq.; Diospolis (415), 92 sqq., 99 sq., 102 sq., 117, 119; of Carthage (416), 99, 102; Milevum (416), 99 sq., 101 sq.; Turin (400), 104 n.; Rome (417), 105; Rome (417 also), 108 sq.; Carthage (417), 110; Carthage (418), 111 sq., 163; Antioch (424), 132; Ephesus (431), 133; Arles (473), 157; Lyons (474), 157; Valence (527-8), 159; Orange (529), 159 sqq.; Caesarea in Mauretania (418), 164; Sardica (343), 164; Philipopolis (343), 164; Carthage (419), 165; Carthage (424), 169; Rome (415), 174; Ephesus (431), 178; Constantinople (426), 185; Alexandria (362), 195; Alexandria (430), 213 sq.; Ephesus (431), 218 sqq.; Rome (August 430), 222 sq.; Alexandria (November 430), 226 sq.; Constantinople (431), 254; Tarsus (431), 254; Antioch (432), 256; Zeugma (433), 263; Anazarbur (433), 263; Seleucia-Ctesiphon (410), 268; Markabta of the Arabs (424), 270; of Acacius (486), 272; of Armenia (435), 273; Antioch (435), 274; Constantinople (553), 275, 280, 289; Constantinople (437), 282; Constantinople (448), 294 sqq., 316; Ephesus (449), 301 sqq.; Rome (449), 309; Chalcidon (451), 311 sqq.; Constantinople (450), 312; Milan (417), 355; Angers (455), 367; Tours (461), 367; Vannes (461-5), 367; Toledo (589), 374; Dvin (609), 416; Ashtishat (365), 422; Ashtishat (435), 424; Valarshapat (491), 424 sq.; Dvin (527, 551), 425.
- Synodical action, broken down in Africa by the Vandal conquest, 152, 171, 346 n.; at Arles, 356, 377; rare in Spain, owing to difficulties of travelling through barbarian conquest, 373; more vigorous in Africa, 393.
- Synodicon*, The, 267, 282.
- Tchonak, *Catholicus* of Armenia, c. 366; 422.
- Te Deum*, The, 47.
- Telemachus, The monk, 42.
- Temples, destruction of, 11; closed, 383; turned into churches, 420.
- Thalassius, Exarch of Caesarea, 315 sqq., 334.
- Theatre, Immorality of the, 366 and n.
- Θεοδόχος, 215.
- Theodore Balsamon, Patriarch of Antioch, 1193-†1200; 178 n.
- Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia (392-†428); 57; *Against those who say that men sin by nature and not by their own will* (416), 97 sq., 197; welcomes Julian of Eclanum 126, 212; visited by Nestorius, 192; his early life, 196; his writings, 196 sqq.; his doctrine of the Person of Christ, 198 sqq.; really a Pelagian, 199; circulation of the works of, 268, 273; posthumous condemnation of, 275.
- Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (423-†58), 173, 189; adviser to John of Antioch, 225; history and writings of, 232 sqq.; *De Providentia* (432), 233; *Graecarum affectionum curatio* (427), 233; *Philotheus sive Religiosa Historia* (444), 233; *Hist. Eccl.* (450), 234;

- Compendium* (451), 234; *Reprehensio XII Anath. Cyrilli* (430), 234; his theology not unexceptionable, 235; author of the *Formulary of Reunion*, 250; sermon at Ephesus, 252; efforts at Reunion, 256 sqq.; accepts it, 263; adviser to Domnus, 281; *Eranistes* (446-7), 287 sq.; Eutychian attack on, 291; his letters, 291; his doctrine, 291 sq.; forbidden to attend at Council of Ephesus (449), 302 sq.; deposed (449), 307; appeals to Pope Leo, 307 sq.; on the 'hegemony' of the Roman See, 308; recalled, 312; admitted to Council of Chalcedon, 316; rehabilitation of, 329.
- Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, 493-†526; 382, 388 *n.*, 394.
- Theodoric I, King of the Visigoths, 419-†51; 342, 367.
- Theodoric II, King of the Visigoths, 453-†66; 342, 371.
- Theodorus Lector (sixth century), 407 *n.*
- Theodosius, archimandrite, 400 sqq., 416.
- Theodosius I, Emp. 379-†95; end of the House of, 397.
- Theodosius II, Emp. 408-†50; 43, 49, 172; intervenes at the election of a bishop for Constantinople, 173, 179; appoints Nestorius, 192; brings Council of Ephesus to an end, 252; court of, 258, 286; welcomes the relics of St. Chrysostom, 277; publishes the *Theodosian Code* (438), 277; summons Council of Ephesus (449), 300, 302; death of, 310.
- Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra, 431-8; 239, 242.
- Theodotus, Bishop of Antioch, 420-†8; 132, 179, 188, 233.
- Theodulus, 186 sq.
- Theology influenced by the customs of the time, 25.
- Theopemptus, Bishop of the Novatianists, 181.
- Theopemptus, one of the envoys of Cyril, 242, 246, 251.
- Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, 385-†412; 50, 53, 142, 180, 187.
- Theophilus the Indian, 429.
- Θεοτόκος, 200, 201 and *n.*, 203 and *n.*, 209 sqq., 262, 282, 324.
- Thomas, Archbishop of Carthage, *c.* 458; 377.
- Thomas, Christians of St., 429.
- Thomists and Scotists, 68.
- Timasius and James, 80, 90, 108.
- Timothy Aelurus (the Cat), Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, 457-†77; 403 sqq.; death of, 411.
- Timothy Salofaciolus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 459-†82; 405 sqq., 412.
- Tiridates I, King of Armenia, 216-†317; 419 sq.
- Toleration, Fathers in favour of, 17 sq.
- Traducianism, 84 sq., 85 *n.*
- Transmarine appeals, 113, 162 sqq.
- Trisagion*, The, 317 and *n.*, 409 *n.*
- Troilus, Bishop of Salamis, 248.
- Turibius, Bishop of Astorga, *c.* 444; 373 sq.
- Uniformity in rites and ceremonies, 8.
- Unity of the Church, 396.
- Unity, Essence of Catholic, 53 *n.*
- Uranus, Bishop of Himeria, 445-51; 289.
- Urban, Bishop of Sicca Veneria, 162 sqq.
- Vahan Mamigouni, Governor of Armenia, 424.
- Valarshapat (Etchmiadzin), 417, 422 *n.*, 424.
- Valentine, Abbot of Adrumetum, 134.
- Valentine, Primate of Numidia, 166 *n.*
- Valentinian III, Emp. 425-†55; 149, 276, 278, 309, 340 sqq., 345, 358 sq., 367, 380, 383, 386 sq., 397.
- Valerian, Bishop of Abbenza, 377.
- Valerius, Count, 126 sq.
- Validity of sacraments conferred in heresy or schism, 4 and *n.*, 178.
- Vandalism, 378.
- Vandals, The, 28, 83; in Spain, 150, 341; in Africa, 150, 314, 343 sqq., 374 sqq.; authorities for, 343 *n.*; conquer Sicily (442), 345; capture Rome (455), 345; their devastations in Aquitaine, 360, 363; persecution by, 375 sqq.; purpose and effects of, 378.
- Venerius, Bishop of Marseilles, 428-†52; 153.
- 'Veni, Redemptor gentium', 222.
- Venice, Founding of, 381.
- Verina, Empress, 398.

- Vertanes, *Catholicus* of Armenia, 333-†41; 421.
- Victor, Bishop of Vita, *Historia persecutionis Africanae Provinciae* [c. 486], 343, 375 sqq.
- Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, 395-†415; 5 sq.
- Vienne and Arles, Rivalry of, 353 sq., 358.
- Vigilantius, 36 sqq.
- Vigils, objection to, 37 sq.; description of a Vigil, 372.
- Vincent of Lerins, 139, 142, 144, 151, 154; his *Commonitorium* (434), 154 sq., 220, 226 n.
- Vincentius Victor, c. 419-20; 85.
- Virgin Birth, The, 222, 224.
- Visigoths, The, in Spain, 150, 342; in Aquitaine, 341; the three Visigothic kingdoms, 341 sq.; become Catholics (sixth century), 343; decline of (seventh century), 343; conquered by Mohammedans (711), 343, 363; become Catholics (589), 374.
- Vitalis, a Carthaginian monk, 140 sq., 144.
- Volusian, 25 sq., 383.
- Wallia, King of the Visigoths, 415-†18; 341.
- Zacharias Rhetor, Bishop of Mitylene, 536-†53; 399 n.
- Zeno, Emp. 474-†91; 377, 398, 406, 409, 411.
- Zosimus, Pope 417-†18, 92, 100, 106 sqq.; acquits Caelestius, 106; acquits Pelagius, 108; Africans remonstrate with, 110; his reply to them (418), 110 sq.; his *Epistola Tractoria*, 113 sq., 124; and Julian of Eclanum, 124 sqq.; unduly considerate towards Caelestius, 131; and Apiarius, 162 sqq.; legates of, 164, 354 sq.

Date Due

4/11			
------	--	--	--

2/24/45			
---------	--	--	--

11/21/54			
----------	--	--	--

9/19/62			
---------	--	--	--

BR

162

K46

51554

AUTHOR

Kidd, B.J.

TITLE

History of the church, vol.3

[illegible]

